Journal of Education and Practice
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.7, No.29, 2016

Teachers' Adoptation Level of Student Centered Education Approach

Zeynep Arseven[1*] Şeyma Şahin[2] Abdurrahman Kılıç[1]
1. Duzce University, Faculty of Education, Duzce, Turkey
2. Duzce University, Institute of Social Sciences, Duzce, Turkey

This paper has been presented at AMSE-AMCE-WEAR Teaching and Training Today for Tomorrow Congress held in Eskişehir, May 30 - June 2, 2016.

Abstract
The aim of this study is to identify how far the student centered education approach is applied in the primary, middle and high schools in Düzce. Explanatory design which is one type of mixed research methods and "sequential mixed methods sampling" were used in the study. 685 teachers constitute the research sample of the quantitative phase of the study and 13 teachers constitute the research sample of the qualitative phase of the study. The quantitative data were collected using "Student Centered Education Scale" and the qualitative data of the study were collected by semi-structured interview form. Mann Whitney U test was applied to determine if the level of adaptation of student centered education approach vary in terms of gender. Kruskal Wallis test was performed so as to see whether teachers' adaptation level of student centered education approach vary in terms of seniority and the type of school (primary, middle and high school) they work at. Qualitative data were analyzed by means of content analysis method. The quantitative findings of the study present that teachers' adaptation level of student centered education is "high" whereas the qualitative findings reveal that the teachers still adopt a teacher centered education in terms of "Planning", "Application" and "Assessment". The findings of the study reveal that teachers' adaptation level of student centered education is not significant in terms of gender and seniority; teachers' adaptation level of student centered education decreases from the primary school to high school, and the perception of teachers in terms of practicability of student centered education is not positive. Some suggestions were developed based on the result of the study.
Keywords: student centered education, student centered education approach, teacher perceptions, planning, application, assessment

1. Introduction

The current aim of education is to train students who are able to solve problems, adapt information to real life, work collaboratively and become a lifelong learners (Hains & Smith, 2012). With traditional methods used in instruction, researchers and teachers noted that persistent shortfalls occur in students' understanding and a great deal of passive knowledge is transferred across all ages and grades including university (Perkins, 1999). It is true that learning environments where children sit on the sidelines while the teacher acts as the sole player in the education process do not get the attention of the students. In such environments, it is not possible for an effective and persistent learning to occur (Valls & Ponce, 2013).

Student centered education approach occurred as traditional education approach and its implementations cannot provide persistent and participatory learning sufficiently, they render educational environments into a too static and formal condition, make students passive and direct them to rote learning (Özpolat, 2013). Student centered education, whose fundamental philosophy is to enable and enhance democracy, social justice, individual freedom and critical thinking, is a pedagogical approach whose roots are based on humanism (Ha, 2014). Student centered approach, which is the most suitable learning model for democratic mentality, means a move away from a didactic, "bolt from the blue" teacher centered approach, to a "bottom-up" one where the teacher acts in the role of facilitator, encouraging students to be self-motivated and independent learners (Bailey & Colley, 2015; Yılmaz 2009).

Drawing on the work of Piaget, Dewey, and Vygotsky, student centered education practices are characterized as an instructional approach that engage the student in the active construction of knowledge (Lattimer, 2015). Learning with regards to constructivist approach is not independent from individuals' own perceptions and understanding. What we know of the world stems from our own interpretations of our experiences (Ertmer & Newby, 2013). The results of recent neuroscience, biology and cognitive psychology studies about how individuals learn can be summarized as "who does the work is who does the learning." This means that the students need more than being a passive listener to learn effectively (Doyle, 2011).

McDonough (2012) states the basic principles of student centered education as follows: 1. Students are included in decisions regarding what and how they will learn and how they are assessed. 2. All students' unique backgrounds, interests, abilities and experiences are valued and respected. 3. Each student is treated as a partner in teaching and learning process. Beaten et al. (2013) define the student centered education in three features: 1. Students are ensured to participate actively in construction their own knowledge. 2. Teachers acts as a coach in

the learning process for the students who have questions or problems, and facilitates students' learning. 3. Teachers use authentic assignments for practical situations and complex educational problems.

According to student centered education approach, schools should be a representative of the real life and students should learn the topics or subjects through experience. In such schools and learning - teaching process designed in this context can acquire the knowledge to be used in real life (Temizkan, 2010). Traditional learning environments are the places consisting of teachers who spends the majority of class time lecturing and including students required to assume a passive role in learning. Learning is an active process in which students should be striving for permanent changes in their knowledge and behavior by utilizing information and resources around them (Stefaniak & Tracey, 2015). Student centered classrooms is a small structure where students have mutual social relationships, conduct independent research and studies. This classrooms prioritize creativity and productive learning experiences (Bulut, 2008). Students require facing complex problems in order to acquire new knowledge and skills, also developing new ways of thinking and acting (Brackenbury, 2012). Students must pay attention to relevant information, organize them with a logical representation, and integrate these information with existing knowledge (Duncan & Buskirk-Cohen, 2011).

Brain research reveals that students should be engaged in talking, listening, reading, viewing, acting, and valuing. Therefore, the primary focus of educators should be to expand the quantity and quality of ways in which a student is exposed to content and context (Caine & Caine, 1991). With this understanding, teacher is a person who not only cares about more than just content but also treat student errors as learning opportunities (Brackenbury, 2012). Teachers should try to nurture a collaborative relationships in the classroom and to create a learning environment in which students can feel secure. Moreover, they should honor students' individual experiences and perspectives, and treat them as partners of the learning process (Moate & Cox, 2015).

One of the educational tools in student centered education is small group work, where students are expected to actively engage in critical discussions about learning topics, problem cases, or projects (Frambach, Driessen, Beh & van der Vleuten, 2014). By the group work including collaborative learning activities, students are provided to share opinions with each other and think reflectively (Brown & King, 2000). Working in groups is reflective of the real world environment where employees collaborate with each other and communicate. Business world prefers and looks for employees who have a strong ability to communicate and contribute to their colleagues (Bishop, Caston & King, 2014).

While student centered education offers many benefits to students, it also presents many challenges. In this approach students think about their future and assume responsibility for their learning (Aslan & Reigeluth, 2016). Some students who have been educated through teacher centered pedagogy prefer teacher centered approach and complain about student centered approach as it is difficult to take responsibility for their own learning (Hains & Smith, 2012).

For teachers who have experienced teacher centered education as a student and familiar with the traditional pedagogical approach as an instructor, giving responsibility for the learning process primarily on the students can be considered as a hard work (Howell, 2006). Teachers' adaptation of a student centered perspective, with its emphasis on trusting students and loosening their grip on content-driven lectures, is challenging. It requires students and professors alike to embrace its inherent contradictions and paradoxes, including being both a facilitator and an evaluator and being both a student and a teacher (Wohlfarth et al., 2008). So, teacher candidates should be active in the learning process, learn through the same methods they will be using with their students once they start teaching (Dole, Bloom & Kowalske, 2016).

Student centered education is one vision of best practice, and it is explicitly promoted by influential international organizations. UNESCO, UNICEF, The International Save the Children Alliance, and The World Bank in particular embed student centered approaches into their understandings of quality education. Especially in low-income countries, student centered education is not preferred and applied effectively. The reason of these countries are not supportive includes the perceptions of appropriate adult–child relationships, school management which evaluates practice according to nonstudent centered criteria, and teachers' preferred self-image as authorities in their own classrooms (Schweisfurth, 2014).

The realization of the transformation expected in education system primarily depends on the teachers who are the active operators of education system and their approval of these respective alterations. Otherwise, student centered approach may be put aside saying that "this model doesn't work" (Akpınar & Aydın 2007). Therefore, it is important to know how teachers perceive student centered education and how far they adopt this approach into their classrooms. Within this context, the aim of this study is to identify how far the student centered education approach is applied in the primary, middle and high schools in Düzce. To this end, the research questions are as follows:

1. What is teachers' adaptation level of student centered education approach? Does the adaptation level of the teachers vary by their gender, seniority and type of school they work at (primary, middle and high school)?
2. What are the student centered education perceptions of teachers who work at primary, middle and high

schools in Düzce?

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

This study uses explanatory design which is one type of mixed research methods. In this design, firstly quantitative data are collected and analyzed, and then qualitative data are collected and analyzed to explore quantitative data. In this way, the weaknesses of one method can be compensated by the strengths of the other method and the combination of quantitative and qualitative data represents a better understanding than they do individually (Creswell, 2003).

2.2. Participants

"Sequential mixed methods sampling" was used in the study. In many studies using this method, the last sample used in the quantitative phase is used as a determiner for sampling in the qualitative phase (Baki & Gökçek, 2012). In this study, quantitative-qualitative sequential sampling was used.

1094 primary school, 1182 middle school and 1021 high school teachers who work in Düzce during 2014-2015 academic years constitute the population in the quantitative phase of the study. 206 primary school, 228 middle school and 251 high school teachers, totally 685 teachers constitute the research sample. Of these teachers, 406 teachers are female (59,3 %) and 279 teachers are male (40,7 %).

The subject group of the qualitative phase of the study consists of 13 teachers, 8 of whom are female and 5 male. 4 of them work at primary schools (1^{st} - 4^{st} grades), 5 of them in middle schools (Mathematics, Social Studies, Science and Tecnology, Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge, Turkish) and 4 in high schools (Turkish Literature, English, Chemistry, History).

2.3. Data Collection Tools

The quantitative data were collected using "Student Centered Education Scale" developed by Şahin, Arseven, Eriş & Kılıç (2016). The scale consists of 32 items and one factor. It explains 40,037 % of the total variance and its internal consistency coefficient value is 0.95. Items are scored as 1- "Strongly Disagree", 2- "Disagree", 3- "Neutral", 4- "Agree" and 5- "Strongly Agree". The ratings of the scale reveal that teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach is as follows: 32-57 "very low", 58-83 "low", 84-109 "medium", 110-135 "high" and 136-160 "very high".

The qualitative data of the study were collected by semi-structured interview form. Semi-structured interviews allow individual respondents to define the world in unique ways (Merriam, 2009). Following the literature review, interview questions which aim to determine teachers' adoptation level of student centered education were prepared. Professionals examined the interview questions, corrected the necessary mistakes and the interview form was made ready. The researchers asked the questions to the interviewers one by one and additional questions were asked depending on the flow of the interview to have more detailed information.

2.4. Data Analysis

The quantitative data of the study were analyzed by Kolmogorov-Simirnow test and it was found that the data do not follow a normal distribution. Mean and standard deviation scores of the answers given for the questions in the scale were calculated as descriptive statistics. Mann Whitney U test was applied to determine if the level of adoptation of student centered education approach vary in terms of gender. Kruskal Wallis test was performed so as to see whether teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach vary in terms of seniority and the type of school (primary, middle and high school) they work at.

Qualitative data were analyzed by means of content analysis method. The interviewed primary school teachers were coded as P1 (1st grade), P2 (2nd grade), P3 (3rd grade), P4 (4th grade); middle school teachers as Mt (Turkish), Mr (Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge), Ost (Science and Technology), Om (Mathematics) and Oss (Social Studies); high school teachers as Hh (History), Hl (Turkish Literature), He (English) and Hc (Chemistry). The data were coded by the researchers and they created relevant themes. Finally, the results were presented in tables.

2.5. Reliability

To determine the internal consistency of the scale in the study, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was examined. The purpose of doing this is to find out the consistency levels of the items in the scale (Seçer, 2013). The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found as 0.954. If the Alpha value is between 0,80 and 1,00, it shows that it is strongly reliable; 0,60 and 0,80, it is quite reliable; 0,40 and 0,60 presents low reliability; 0,00 and 0,40 shows that it is not reliable (Özdamar, 1999).

For the reliability of qualitative data of the study, the data collected by the interview were coded by the researchers separately. The degree of intercoder agreement calculated using Miles & Huberman's (1994)

reliability formula was found 87,8 %. In order to support the reliability of the study, some direct quotations from the interviews were noted.

3. Findings

3.1. Teachers' Adaptation Level of Student Centered Education Approach

3.1.1. Quantitative Data

The results of the statistics that shows teachers' adaptation level of student centered education approach are given in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach

	N	X	S
Primary School	206	132,65	15,94
Middle School	228	130,71	18,09
High School	251	125,60	20,27
Total	685	129,42	18,55

The number of the teacher participants who work at primary, middle and high schools is 685. The mean score of the primary school teachers is $\bar{x}$=132.65, middle school teachers is $\bar{x}$=130.71 and high school teachers is $\bar{x}$=125.60. This reveals that teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach ($\bar{x}$=129.42) is "high".

3.1.1.1. Teachers' Adoptation Level of Student Centered Education Approach by Gender

The results of Mann Whitney U test that show whether the ratings of teachers from Student Centered Education Scale vary by gender are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach by gender

		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
Total	**Woman**	406	341,80	138771,00	56150,000	,848
	Man	279	344,75	96184,00		

As seen in Table 2, there is not a significant difference in the total score of Mann Whitney U test (U=56150,000, p>.05) which was applied in order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the ratings of Student Centered Education Scale vary by gender. Therefore, it can be stated that gender doesn't affect teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach.

3.1.1.2. Teachers' Adoptation Level of Student Centered Education Approach by Seniority

The results of Kruskal Wallis test that show whether the ratings of teachers from Student Centered Education Scale vary by seniority are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Teachers' adoptation level of student centered education approach by seniority

		N	Mean Rank	sd	X^2	P	Difference
Total	**1-5**	142	326,40	3	2.217	.529	-
	6-10	158	335,75				
	11-15	155	346,73				
	16 and up	230	355,72				

As seen in Table 3, there is not a significant difference in the total score of Kruskal Wallis test (X^2=22.026, p<.05) which was applied in order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the ratings of Student Centered Education Scale vary by seniority. Therefore, it can be stated that seniority doesn't effect teachers' adaptation level of student centered education approach.

3.1.1.3. Teachers' Adaptation Level of Student Centered Education Approach by School Type

The results of Kruskal Wallis test that show whether the ratings of teachers from Student Centered Education Scale vary by the type of school they work are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Teachers' adaptation level of student centered education approach by school type

		N	Mean Rank	sd	X^2	P	Difference
Total	**Primary School**	206	383,06	2	24.070	.000	Middle School-High School Primary School-High School
	Middle School	228	358,61				
	High School	251	295,94				

As seen in Table 4, there is a significant difference in the total score of Kruskal Wallis test (X^2=24.070, p<.05) which was applied in order to determine whether there is a significant difference between the ratings of Student Centered Education Scale vary by the type of school (primary, middle and high school) they work.

The results of Mann Whitney U tests applied in order to determine the source of the difference of the total score reveal that there is a difference between middle school and high school teachers' ratings (U= 23477,000, p<.05), between primary and high school teachers' ratings (U= 19178,500, p<.05) whereas there is

not a significant difference between primary and middle school teachers' ratings (U= 21906,500, p>.05). According to mean ranks, the highest mean in the total score belongs to primary school teachers and the lowest mean belongs to high school teachers.

3.1.2. Qualitative Data

The data collected by the interviews with the teachers about their adaptation level of student centered education were categorized in three themes which are "planning", "application" and "assessment", and these themes are put into the tables. The student centered education practices of primary, middle and high school teachers were presented in tables separately. The student centered education practices in the theme of "planning" were given in Table 5.

Table 5. The student centered education practices in the theme of "planning"

Categories	Student Centered	Primary School	Middle School	High School	Teacher Centered	Primary School	Middle School	High School
Annual Plan	Informing students at the beginning of the year		Mst		Using pre-designed plans available on the internet	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	Hc, Hl, Hh
	Informing parents	P4		He	Making small changes in pre-designed plans	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	Hl, Hh
	Determining students' levels before planning			He	Following guide books	P3		
	Preparing their own plans			He				
Lesson Plans					Making no plan	P3		
					Not getting students' opinions	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He, Hl, Hh, Hc
					Not preparing a written lesson plan	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He, Hl, Hh, Hc
					Following guide books /textbooks	P1	Mr	Hc
					Making a draft plan in head	P2, P4	Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He, Hl, Hh
Activity Plans	Getting students' opinions	P4			Not planning learning activities	P1, P2, P3	Mt, Mss, Mst	Hl, Hh, Hc
	Planning learning activities proper to students' level	P4	Mm	He	Not getting students' opinions	P1, P2, P3	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	Hl, Hh, Hc
					Searching information about the subject from internet		Mr	
					Finding tests about the subject		Mr	

As seen in Table 5 above, the student centered education practices in the theme of "planning" were collected under three categories. These are "annual plan", "lesson plans" and "activity plans".

It was obviously seen that all the teachers but one (He) don't prepare their own annual plans and they use pre-designed available plans on internet by making some changes on them. None of them make a written lesson plans and they teach using teacher guidebooks by making a draft plan in mind. A teacher stated *"There is not much need to make big changes in the annual plan. For example, I often check to see if the topics about 23rd April occur at the similar time with the date. Actually I'm following the guidebook. I don't use any plans as I used to prepare in the beginning of the term in the past" (P3)*

It was also seen that the teachers are far apart from the student centered approach in terms of activity planning. Most of the teachers who were interviewed don't plan activities. One of the teachers who stated that he doesn't plan activities said: *"During the first years, you are in the step of learning things and become more nervous, more prepared, though. But now, we memorized every procedure about how and when to do things. It is still open to question that if it is good or bad." (Mss)*

Only one of the teachers said that he gets students' opinion while planning the activities. Therefore, it can be stated that the teachers are far away from student centered education in terms of activity planning. The student centered education practices in the theme of "application" were given in Table 6.

Table 6. The student centered education practices in the theme of "application"

Categories	Student Centered	Primary School	Middle School	High School	Teacher Centered	Primary School	Middle School	High School
Individual Differences	Taking into account of the level of student	P3	Mst		Not spending time with students who can not learn		Mt	
	Planning peer tutoring	P1, P2, P3						
	Spending time with students individually	P1, P2		He				
Treating Students	Supporting students to express their ideas	P4	Mm		Punishing students who don't do their homeworks	P4		
	Setting the classroom rules with students	İ4			Placing the popular students in social activities	P3		
	Dealing with students' problems	P3			Having low expectations from students	P2		
	Thinking that each student can learn	P1, P3			Not caring about the learning of all students			Hh, Hc
	Having high expectations from students			He	Not including students in group formation process			He
	Not hesitating to accept their mistakes	P3		He	Setting classroom rules without students			He
					Thinking that students should be taken out of the class if necessary			Hl
Education Applications	Trying to engage all students in learning	P1, P2, P4	Mst, Mm, Mss	He	Not trying to engage all students in learning	P3	Mss, Mm, Mt, Mr	Hh, Hc
	Using cooperative learning	P4	Mst	He	Not getting disturbed by students' movements in class	P2		Hh, Hc
	Allowing students to interact with each other	P1, P2, P3, P4		He	Not using cooperative learning	P1, P2	Mm, Mss, Mr	Hl, Hh, Hc
	Organizing social activities	P3			Dictating information to students summarized by teacher	P1	Mt, Mst, Mm	Hl, Hc, Hh
	Encouraging students to explore information		Mst	He	Doing unplanned activities depends on the situation	P3		
	Doing activities which encourage students to think			He	Giving the information at the beginning of the course readily	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss	Hl, Hh, Hc
	Trying to ingratiate lessons to students			Hl	Using only the activities in the book	P1, P2	Mss, Mt	
					Getting students to the board one by one	P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	
					Not doing learning activities as required	P2	Mst, Mr	Hl, Hc
					Underlining the textbook and reflecting it to the board			Hh
					Preparing students to university entrance exams in the lesson			Hl
Using Materials	Exhibit students' products in the classroom	P2, P4			Mostly using textbooks	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mst	Hh
	Preparing their own materials	P1	Mm, Mss	He	Using ready materials available on the internet	P1, P2, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	
	Preparing presentations appropriate to student levels		Mst	He	Using smart board for watching video	P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	Hl
Methods, Techniques and Activities	Drama	P1, P2, P3	Mt, Mss	He	Lecture	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	Hl, Hh, Hc
	Cutting and gluing	P1, P2, P4		He	Watching/listening lectures from Eba, Morpa etc.	P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	
	Writing stories /completing stories	P3, P4			Question and answer	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He, Hh
	Discussion	P4	Mt, Mm, Mss	He	Solving tests	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He
	Travel and observation	P4						
	Educational games	P4	Mst, Mm	He				
	Brainstorming	P4	Mst					
	Six thinking hats	P4	Mst					
	Information contests	P3						
	Experiment		Mst					
	Concept map		Mst					
	Poster		Mst, Mss					
	Writing composition			He				

As seen in Table 6 above, the student centered education practices in the term of "Application" were collected under five categories. These are "individual differences", "treating students", "education applications",

"using materials" and "methods, techniques and activities".

Teachers don't care about students' learning as an individual and do not try to engage them in learning. They give the information at the beginning of the course readily and do not facilitate them to discover knowledge on their own. Cooperative learning is not included in the lesson and there are no activities to guide the students to think in the classroom. Instead of this, the teachers underline the textbook and reflect it to the board, make the students solve problems getting them one by one in front of the board, dictate information to students previously summarized by teacher.

Mainly course book is preferred as an instructional material. Smart boards are only used in order to make students watch videos from several educational sites. This can clearly be seen from the sentences of a teacher: *"I think course books are sufficient to teach. I teach by connecting the past with the present. I tell them to take notes. I think words fly away, writings remain" (Hh).*

It clearly seems that teachers often use the traditional methods and techniques in all the lessons. Especially, they prefer lecture in teaching new topics. They mostly use lecture and question-answer methods while teaching. And they often use teacher centered activities such as watching videos and doing tests. One of the teachers stated *"If the tutorial time was longer, I would engage my students in the lesson more actively. I don't have a chance to create time for students to solve problems or to invite them to the board individually. I teach 10th, 11th and 12th grades this term. It is only three hours for chemistry lesson in the 12th grades. Time is troublesome. The unit is extensive. LYS (One of the university entrance exams in Turkey) is another case. I usually lecture and repeat the important points again and again when the students don't perceive." (Hc)*

A teacher of English from high school and almost all of the teachers from primary and middle schools state that they use several student centered methods and techniques in the classroom. However, when we elaborate on it, the use of these methods and techniques constitutes only a little part of the lessons and they are rarely applied in the classrooms. Some of the teacher views on this topic are as follows:

"We used group discussion method once or twice in the previous term. We give two subjects to students to discuss but as they are 4th grades and going to begin middle school next year, we teach accordingly. I tried six thinking hats but there often occurs a problem when choosing a student for the black hat although we cast lots for it." (P4)

"We use six thinking hats, fishbone diagram, brainstorming, but I cannot use it with all the topics in the 7th grades, only one topic may be. We use it if there is a suitable activity in the book." (Mst)

According to all, it can be stated that the teachers are far away from student centered education in terms of methods, techniques and the activities used in the classroom.

The student centered education practices in the theme of "assessment" were given in Table 7.

Table 7. The student centered education practices in the theme of "assessment"

Categories	Student Centered	Primary School	Middle School	High School	Teacher Centered	Primary School	Middle School	High School
Assessment Methods	Formative assessment (to determine learning deficiencies)	P3, P4	Mm		Written exam (open-ended, multiple choice, true-false, fill in the blanks)	P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He, Hl, Hh, Hc
	Portfolio	P4		He	Grading students' classroom performances	P1, P2, P3, P4	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss, Mst	He, Hl, Hh, Hc
	Self-assessment	P4			Project (in the style of term paper)		Mm, Mss, Mst	
	Teacher assessment	P4			Quiz		Mm	He

The "assessment" theme consists of one category called "assessment methods". When the Table 7 is analyzed, it is clearly seen that they prefer traditional assessment methods such as written exams, oral exams and project (similar to a term paper, not in a manner of developing metacognition, without feedback in spite of being monitored by the teachers). Teachers stated that the grades assigned for the students also depended on the number of minuses and plusses they got for the tasks in the class, class participation, their moral attitudes, doing homework, bringing materials to the class etc.

A teacher who stated that she uses portfolio and self-assessment said *"The students don't get any marks for the portfolios as they used to do it in the past. They used to get marks for them in the 1st and 2nd grades. Anyway, they usually include the highly marked papers in their portfolios." (P4)* It can be stated that this condition is not relevant to the aim of assessment.

Evaluating teachers' adaptation level of student centered education approach in terms of the type of

school they work, we can state that primary school teachers are the ones who are more likely to use this approach in terms of "planning", "application" and "assessment". The middle school teachers are ranked as the number two in terms of using this approach and the high school teachers are in the last line.

3.2. Teachers' Perceptions of Student Centered Education

Teachers' perceptions of student centered education are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Teachers' perceptions of student centered education

			Primary School	Middle School	High School
Is student-centered education possible?	**Yes**	Should be			Hl, He
	No	Ministry of Education gives the curriculum and the curriculum is not suitable for it	P4		
		There is an education system that includes exams and tests	P4	Mss	Hc
		It can not be applied everywhere (village schools, multigrade classrooms, etc.)	P4		
		The success of students at intermediate level decreases	P4		
		I waste time and can not complete the content	P4	Mr, Mm, Mss	
		Parents do not support (material aid, etc.)	P4		
		Education sistem is not stable	P1		
		There are lots of procedures	P1		
		Parents are biased	P1		
		Education should not be only based on student centered, must be combined with teacher-centered	P3		Hh
		It reduces teachers' prestige	P3		
		Learning activities in the books are not good at all	P2		
		Classroom/school environments are not appropriate		Mst, Mss	
		Planning the student center education is difficult		Mt	
		Students' readiness are not suitable for it		Mst, Mss, Mr	Hc
		It is hard for students to reach information		Mt	
		I am not adequate for it		Mr	
Are you a student-centered teacher?		Student-Centered	P4	Mst	
		Both student-centered and teacher-centered	P1, P2	Mr, Mt, Mm, Mss	Hl, He, Hh
		My student-centeredness weakens from 1st grade to 4th grade	P3		
		Teacher-Centered			Hc

When the Table 8 is analyzed, it is seen that only two teachers answered "yes" and others "no" for the question "Is the student centered education possible?" The teachers who think that student centered education cannot be applied suggested a lot of reasons for that. These reasons were usually related to the program, parents and students. Only one teacher (Mt) stated that planning is difficult, and another teacher (Mr) said that he felt incompetent to use student centered approach. Some examples of quotations from the teachers' perception of student centered education are as follows:

"I am against the only use of student centered education. I think a combination of student centered and teacher centered education should be used. The students should be the ones who demand, but they don't. So, first of all, we should teach them to demand something." (Hh)

"Of course, we can adopt student centered education but it cannot be like the one we used to have while studying at university. Students are distracted by many things. We cannot always arouse their interests. It is both because of the conditions and the student potential." (Mst)

"Because of the intensive syllabus, we certainly apply teacher centered education. The hours for math course should be increased. There is not enough time to do activities as students' readiness level is not suitable. Student centered or individualized teaching are well far from truth." (Mm)

"The student centered and teacher centered education should be balanced. The attention span decreases if we use only student centered approach. They do not know how to listen but want to do thinks on their own, say something or speak and do activities. But when you start to teach, they can't balance." (P3)

"It is true that adopting a student centered education approach prepares students for life. But it's not suitable for curriculum. Only if you repeal the test system, you can gain success through student centered education. If you adopt student centered education, it helps already successful students but no other students at average level. Because of the test system, we should often do tests; otherwise, many problems occur between the ones who do tests and those who don't." (P4)

Taking into account all of these reasons, it is clear that the teachers couldn't comprehend the philosophy behind student centered education and they misperceived student centered approach. The teachers think that it is not possible to apply student centered education and they don't consider themselves as student centered educators. Only two of them stated that they consider themselves as student centered teachers answering to the interview question "Do you consider yourself as student centered or teacher-centered teachers?"

4. Results

This study aims to examine the level of primary, middle and high school teachers' adaptation level of student centered education. It can be stated that a type of student who can solve problems, transfer his knowledge to the real life, work cooperatively and become a lifelong student cannot be achieved through content based, course book based and teacher centered education approach.

The results of the study reveal that the quantitative findings are not parallel with the qualitative findings. The quantitative findings of the study present teachers' adaptation level of student centered education is "high" whereas the qualitative findings reveal that the teachers still adopt a teacher centered education in terms of "planning", "application" and "assessment". This finding correlates with Aliusta, Özer & Kan's study carried out in high schools in Northern Cyprus in 2015. The quantitative findings of Aliusta, Özer & Kan (2015) revealed that student centered teaching strategies adopted were at "above medium level" while the qualitative findings showed that teacher centered education approach was still in power.

The most important reason for the inconsistency of the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study may be because the teachers couldn't been able to comprehend the philosophy behind the student centered education. According to quantitative findings, although the teachers describe themselves as student centered educators, the qualitative findings reveal the truth that they are well far from this approach. The results of Duru's study (2015) which was a metaphor study conducted with teacher candidates reveal that the teachers have a tendency to perceive themselves as student centered educators although they do not really have it. In his study, Kılıç (2006) determined that the level of teachers for applying teaching skills is quite low. It will not possible for the teacher candidates to adopt student centered approach in such a teacher education system that does not provide teacher candidates with the practices of student centered teaching and enable them to get actively involved in learning (Dole, Bloom & Kowalske, 2016). Unless some practices and activities of student recognition techniques with professional teaching skills are included in teacher education, thinking that the teachers in the future professions will show the effective behavior of teaching will be unrealistic (Kılıç, 2006).

It may be stated that teachers are well far away from student centered education in terms of "planning", "application", and "assessment". They don't prepare written daily lesson plans and have only a draft plan in mind or teach using the teachers' guidebook. The results of Oğuz & Bayındır's study (2009) revealed that the rate of the teachers who design lesson plans in accordance with constructivism are very low. According to Oğuz's study (2009) more than half of the English teachers (63 %) prefers pre-designed plans and 46.7 % of the senior teachers thinks that they don't need to prepare daily lesson plans.

The findings of the study reveal that teachers commonly use traditional instructional methods and techniques. Yeşilyurt (2013) states that primary teachers often use lecture, question and answer, demonstration and discussion, and that they rarely use cooperative learning, projects, concept maps and brainstorming. In Demir & Özden's study (2013), teachers of Life Science believe in the importance of using student centered strategies, methods and techniques but they cannot apply them in their classrooms because of several reasons. A study of Maden, Durukan & Akbaş (2011) argues that the level of teacher perception of the benefits of using student centered methods and techniques is high; however, the readiness level of the teachers for student centered teaching is quite low. Saracaloğlu & Karasakaloğlu (2011) argues that teachers of Turkish avoid using student centered methods and techniques because of physical impossibilities and classroom size. Gömleksiz & Öner (2013) states that the middle school students don't feel active enough themselves in the classroom during the instructional process of social studies course.

It is found that teachers usually prefer traditional assessment methods such as written and oral exams, that they do not prefer alternative assessment methods such as portfolio assessment, self-assessment and peer-assessment. Parmaksız & Yanpar (2006) reveal that teachers of social studies do not feel confident in using alternative assessment methods and don't often use them in their classrooms. The results of Coşkun, Gelen & Öztürk's study (2009) reveal that candidates of Turkish teacher have a low level of competency in the assessment of students.

The quantitative findings of the study reveal that teachers' adaptation level of student centered education is not significant in terms of gender and seniority. Aliusta, Özer & Kan's study (2015) reveals that this level doesn't change according to gender and seniority. Bulut (2008) states that the level of teachers' use of student centered activities in term of gender is not significant level. However, in Maden, Durukan & Akbaş's study (2011) it is revealed that gender doesn't show a significant difference in terms of the perceptions for student centered education and the perceptions of less experienced teachers for student centered education are at higher level. Aydoğdu & Selanik-Ay (2016) states that the less experienced teachers and female teachers' tendency to show student centeredness is higher.

According to the quantitative findings of the study, there is a significant difference between primary, middle and high school teachers' adaptation level of student centered education. Teachers' adaptation level of student centered education decreases from the primary school to high school. The reasons determined by the teachers about why the adaptation of student centered education in middle school and especially high schools is

less dominant are that their syllabuses are more intensive, they have to deal with TEOG (high school entrance exam in Turkey), YGS (the first step of university entrance exam in Turkey), LYS (the second step of university entrance exam in Turkey), some activities such as group work, educational games etc. are more appropriate for primary school students.

According to the findings of the study, the perception of teachers in terms of practicability of student centered education is not positive. Teachers think that it is not possible to apply student centered teaching and do not describe themselves as student centered teacher. According to the results of the metaphor study of Duru (2015), 85.7 % of teacher candidates of elementary education believe in the student centered education, 10.1 % of them think that both teacher centered and student centered is practicable. Maden, Durukan & Akbaş's qualitative study (2011) reveals that the level of teachers' perception in terms of the benefits of student centered education is high. This results support that quantitative studies should be supported by qualitative studies.

Based on the results of this study, some implications with the aim of integrating student centered education approach into education system are given as follows:

- ✓ Teachers should be familiar with the curriculum.
- ✓ Teachers shouldn't use pre-designed plans. They should prepare their own plans in accordance with the curriculum.
- ✓ Teachers should carry out the learning and teaching process in accordance with the student centered education.
- ✓ Teachers should use alternative assessment methods.
- ✓ Teacher candidates should gain a student centered education philosophy.
- ✓ Teacher candidates should engage in active learning and be trained with the student centered methods to use in their future profession.
- ✓ Teachers' inadequacies about student centered education should be compensated by in-service trainings.
- ✓ Quantitative data in the scientific studies should be supported by qualitative data.

References

Akpınar, B. & Aydın, K. (2007). Change in education and teachers' perceptions of change. *Education and Sciences, 32(*144), 71-80.

Aliusta, G. O., Özer, B. & Kan, A. (2015). The implementation of student-centred instructional strategies in schools in North Cyprus. *Education and Sciences, 40*(181), 77-91.

Aslan, S. & Reigeluth, C. M. (2016). Examining the challenges of learner-centered education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 97*(4), 63-68.

Aydoğdu, B. & Selanik-Ay, T. (2016). Determination of teacher characteristics which support constructivist learning environments. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 63, 293-310.

Bailey, G. & Colley, H. (2015). 'Learner-centered' assessment policies in further education: putting teachers' time under pressure. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training, 67*(2), 153–168.

Baki, A. & Gökçek, T. (2012). A general overview of mixed method researches. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences, 11*(42), 1-21.

Beaten, M., Struyven, K. & Dochy, F. (2013). Student-centred teaching methods: Can they optimise students' approaches to learning in professional higher education?. *Studies in Educational Evaluation,* 39, 14-22.

Bishop, C. F., Caston, M. I. & King, C. A. (2014). Learner-centered environments: Creating effective strategies based on student attitudes and faculty reflection. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14(*3), 46–63.

Brackenbury, T. (2012). A qualitative examination of connections between learner-centered teaching and past significant learning experiences. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12*(4), 12–28.

Brown, S. W. & King, F. B. (2000). Constructivist pedagogy and how we learn: Educational psychology meets international studies. *International Studies Perspectives,* 1, 245–254.

Bulut, İ. (2008). Teacher views on student-centered practices in the new primary education curriculum. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice,* 56, 521-546.

Caine, R. N. & Caine, G. (1991). *Making connections: Teaching and the human brain*. Viginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Coşkun, E., Gelen, İ. & Öztürk, E. P. (2009). The proficiency perceptions of pre-service Turkish Language teachers about educational planning, aplication and evaluation. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 6*(12), 140-163.

Creswell, J. W. (2003*). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Demir, S. & Özden, S. (2013). Primary school teachers' opinions of instructional strategies, methods and techniques: A descriptive study for Scince of Life. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute,* 14, 59-75.

Dole, S., Bloom, L. & Kowalske, K. (2016). Transforming pedagogy: Changing perspectives from teacher-centered to learner-centered. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning, 10*(1), 1-15.

Doyle, T. (2011). *Learner-centered teaching*. (First ed.). Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Duncan, T. & Buskirk-Cohen, A. A. (2011). Exploring learner-centered assessment: A cross-disciplinary approach. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*(2), 246-259.

Duru, S. (2015). A metaphor analysis of elementary student teachers' conceptions of teachers in student- and teacher-centered contexts. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 60, 281-300.

Ertmer, P. A. & Newby, T. J. (2013). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *6*(4), 50-72.

Frambach, J. M., Driessen, E. W., Beh, P. & Van Der Vleuten, C. P. M. (2014). Quiet or questioning? Students'discussion behaviors in student-centered education across cultures. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(6), 1001–1021.

Gömleksiz, M. N. & Öner, Ü. (2013). An assessment of students' perceptions of constructivist learning-teaching process in Social Studies course in terms of several variables. *Adıyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 6*(14), 281-313.

Ha, P. L. (2014). The politics of naming: Critiquing "learner-centered" and "teacher as facilitator" in English language and humanities classrooms. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 42(*4), 392–405.

Hains, B. J. & Smith, B. (2012). Student-centered course design: Empowering students to become self-directed learners. *Journal of Experiential Education, 35*(2), 357–374.

Howell, C. L. (2006). Student perceptions of learner-centered education. *Annual Conference of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association.*

Kılıç, A. (2006). Levels of observation and practice of teaching skills of student-teachers. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies,* 16, 155-168.

Lattimer, H. (2015). Translating theory into practice: Making meaning of learner centered education frameworks for classroom-based practitioners. *International Journal of Educational Development,* 45, 65–76.

Maden, S., Durukan, E. & Akbaş, E. (2011). Primary school teachers' perceptions of student centered teaching. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 8*(16), 255-269.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McDonough, M. (2012). Applying learner-centered principles: From face to face instruction to a hybrid course learning format. *Journal of Learning in Higher Education, 8*(2), 31-39.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis : An expanded sourcebook. (2nd ed.). California : SAGE Publications.

Moate, R. M. & Cox, J. A. (2015). Learner-centered pedagogy: Considerations for application in a didactic course. *The Professional Counselor, 5*(3), 379–389.

Oğuz, A. (2009). Prospective English teachers' views about preparing lesson plans. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 6*(11), 456-477.

Oğuz, A. & Bayındır, N. (2009). Elementary school teachers' views regarding instructional planning. *Elementary Education Online, 8*(3), 902-921.

Özdamar, K. (1999). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi 1.* (2nd ed.). Eskişehir: Kaan Kitabevi.

Özpolat, V. (2013). The place of student-centered approach in teachers' occupational priorities. *National Education,* 200, 5-27.

Parmaksız, R. Ş. & Yanpar, T. (2006). The usableness of alternative assesment approaches in social studies. *Fırat University Journal of Social Sciences, 16*(2), 159-172.

Perkins, D. (1999). The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Leadership,* 6-11.

Saracaloğlu, A. S. & Karasakaloğlu, N. (2011). The opinions of Turkish teachers on teaching methods and techniques. *Elementary Education Online, 10*(3), 952-960.

Schweisfurth, M. (2014). Learner-centred pedagogy: Towards a post-2015 agenda for teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Development,* 40, 259–266.

Seçer, İ. (2013). S*PSS ve LISREL ile pratik veri analizi ve raporlaştırma.* (1st ed.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Stefaniak, J. E. & Tracey, M. W. (2015). An exploration of student experiences with learner-centered instructional strategies. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 6*(2), 95-112.

Şahin, Ş., Arseven, Z., Eriş, M. & Kılıç, A. (2016). Student centered education scale: A validity and reliability study. *3. International Eurasian Educational Research Congress,* Muğla.

Temizkan, M. (2010). The effect of Turkish language course II which arranged according to student-centered learning on attitudes towards talking skill. *National Education,* 187, 86-102.

Valls, F. R. & Ponce, G. A. (2013). Classroom, the we space: Developing student-centered practices for second language learner (SLL) students. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 21*(55), 1-22.

Wohlfarth, D., Sheras, D., Bennett, J. L., Simon, B., Pimentel, J. H. & Gabel, L. E. (2008). Student perceptions

of learner-centered teaching. *A Journal of Scholarly Teaching,* 3, 67-74.

Yeşilyurt, E. (2013). Teachers' aim in using teaching methods and problems they encounter. *Atatürk University Journal of Social Sciences Institute, 17*(1), 163-188.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). Democracy through learner-centered education: A Turkish perspective. *International Review of Education,* 55, 21–37.