CSSR2019

6th International Conference on Science & Social Research 2019
https://cssr.uitm.edu.my/2019/
Parkroyal Penang Resort, Batu Ferringhi, Pulau Pinang, Malaysia, 04-05 Dec 2019

What Do ESL Learners Perceive as Effective 21st Century L2 Pedagogies?

Doreen Dillah [1], Janaki Manokaran [1], Ezathul Zerafena Mohd Ris [1], Leele Susana Jamian [2]

[1] Centre of Foundation Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Selangor, Kampus Dengkil, 43800 Dengkil, Selangor, Malaysia
[2] Faculty of Education, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Selangor, Kampus Puncak Alam, Selangor, Malaysia

doreen@uitm.edu.my; janaki7819@uitm.edu.my; ezathul7592@uitm.edu.my; leele@uitm.edu.my
Tel:: 03-89245448

Abstract

Low proficiency in English, poor communication skills, problem-solving, and critical thinking cause unemployment among local graduates. This study explored learners' perception of pedagogies that work effectively for language acquisition based on eight dimensions of 21st century L2 pedagogies. A descriptive research design combining quantitative and qualitative methods was utilised to extract data from 60 undergraduates. Findings revealed that TESL students had higher overall mean scores and preferences for Learner-centred Models compared to Mathematics students who chose Appropriate Tools and Promote Learning without Borders. Their preferences of pedagogies signify what works best for their mastery of L2.

Keywords: 21st Century L2 (second language) pedagogies; ESL (L2) learners; dimensions; undergraduates

1.0 Introduction

Murphy (2008) defines pedagogy as the "interactions between teachers, students, and the learning environment and the learning tasks" that highlight the importance of interactions between the teacher and students, where teaching and learning occur, and activities carried out in the process. While it is common to find the implementation of various language pedagogies in language teaching, their effectiveness depends on many factors – teaching contents, learners' diverse needs, classroom, and its surrounding, among others. The current work probed into what second language (L2) learners perceive as effective pedagogies for their language development. The unsettled issue of low proficiency in the English language among Malaysian students in general and local graduates specifically highlights the need to look at what they regard as useful for L2 acquisition.

Identifying what they regard as working effectively for them will help their mastery of the English language and assist them in identifying their learning strengths and weaknesses, developing strategic ways of learning, and efficiently acquiring the much-needed skills to face global challenges (Saavedra & Opfer, 2012, cited in Scott, 2015). Thus, this study was conducted to answer the following research questions; "What do TESL and Mathematics students perceive as the effective language pedagogies for their language development?" and "Is there similarity (or difference) in their preferences for and levels of belief based on the selected dimensions of effective language pedagogies?" In this work, the students' perception of the pedagogies that work effectively for learning the English language is determined based on what they "believe" as the best for learning to take place. Therefore, the two terms are interchangeably used throughout the paper.

The research was conducted amongst students taking educational-based courses, namely TESL and Mathematics, at a local university in Malaysia. The samples from the two educational-based courses were based primarily on the fact that they are future teachers who have their own choices of pedagogies. The different contents in these courses would demand and impose varied approaches in learning. Another reason is that comparing the perceived effective pedagogies between the two groups of learners would yield more enriched data on learners' language pedagogies of diverse needs. Moreover, findings of the two groups of learners could indicate their agreement (and disagreement) on the instructors' teaching approaches and their effectiveness. This could also serve as an indicator of whether or not these future teachers would apply the approaches that were used to teach them in the future. Therefore, tapping into their pedagogies preferences would help language educators have a better understanding of the learners and their different needs. Such findings are also essential to help language practitioners reconsider language pedagogies and match them based on learners' preferences for successful L2 acquisition.

Although undergraduates' low English proficiency may vary, numerous works have suggested that relevant educational authorities revamp the current syllabi at schools and tertiary institutions. Similarly, some researchers have highlighted the fact that local graduates still lack the essential skills pertinent for high employability, including proficiency in English (Fong, Sidhu, & Fook, 2014; Ibrahim, Kamariah, Nor Hayati & Othman, 2013), despite the number of years in school and the time spent for learning the language. Moreover, the various efforts done at all levels of education by the Ministry of Education have not been fully effective in boosting graduates' mastery of the English language. This work was motivated by identifying pedagogies that learners themselves perceive as effective for their L2 acquisition.

Moreover, to the best of researchers' knowledge, data on learners' effective language pedagogies among undergraduates in different university programmes are scarce. Hence, this study may have several contributions; it provides data on learners' beliefs of effective L2 pedagogies and invaluable information that could help relevant practitioners redesign language practices and reconsider teaching methods that are more relevant for effective language development. Besides, findings may enrich the body of knowledge on effective pedagogies that will enable attaining the skills in line with the industries' ever-changing needs and contemporary language education. The failures in implementing suitable pedagogies and the importance of adapting the 21 Century skills and pedagogies have been highlighted by various researchers (Leggat, 2015; Munoz, 2015; Kashef, Khorasani, & Zahabi, 2014). This work also provides data on learners' preferences for language pedagogies that could be used for designing suitable language policies are suited for future language educators.

2.0 Methodology
A mixed-method of the quantitative and qualitative design was utilised through a set of self-constructed effective 21st-century language pedagogies belief questionnaires based on the contents of *"The Futures of Learning 3: What Kind of Pedagogies for the 21st Century?"* by Scott (2015). It consists of 3 categories; learners' demographic profile, eight dimensions of effective 21st-century language pedagogies, and learners' suggestions of pedagogies that facilitate their language acquisition. The eight dimensions were: customises learning (D1), emphasises project and problem-based learning (D2), cultivates creativity and innovation (D3), employs appropriate learning tools and promotes learning without borders (strategic questioning, use of mobile technologies and social) (D4), teaches metacognitive skills (D5), highlights learner-centred models (D6), recognises learning through open education (D7), and assesses for deeper understanding and competency (D8). Each dimension comprises 4 to 6 items, and learners' responses were based on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

The questionnaire was sent to two experts in the related field, an expert in language pedagogy and another on questionnaire construction, to exclude any double-barrelled questions. The responses were extracted from a sample of 30 TESL and 30 Mathematics students randomly chosen from the population of B. Ed. TESL (Hons) programme and B. Ed (Hons) Science (Mathematics) programme. Both groups were in the same batch and the final year of their studies. Analyses were done using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS Statistics, version 23). The overall mean scores, frequency measures, and mean were extracted using descriptive statistics. The independent sample T-Test was also done to yield a significant difference (or similarity) between the groups' overall mean scores of the dimensions and items. Meanwhile, the interview responses were analysed qualitatively to yield a clearer picture of what learners perceive as best for their L2 development.

3.0 Findings
Based on the selected dimensions of effective language pedagogies, the discussion focuses on the pedagogies learners perceive as the most effective for their language development and similarity (or difference) in their preferences. TESL students attained the highest mean score in D6 (M=5.03, SD=.677), i.e., the pedagogies that highlight learner-centred models, but the lowest mean score for D7 (M=3.02, SD=0.893), i.e., learning through open education. Meanwhile, Mathematics students had the highest mean score in D4 (M=4.31, SD=.670), i.e., the pedagogies that employ appropriate tools and promote learning without borders. Like TESL students, Mathematics students also had the lowest mean score for D7 (M=3.06, SD=.862) (Table 1).

The findings suggest that the TESL students prefer the learner-centred model that focuses on actively involved in their learning as the most efficient way to learn the English language. In contrast, Mathematics students perceive in using appropriate tools for language learning to take place. Interestingly, the two groups shared similarities in what they perceive as the least effective for their

language development (lowest mean scores for D7). Items listed for D7 include blended learning, e-learning, iLearn, Learning Management System (LMS), and MOOC. In other words, students generally indicate that language learning is ineffective through open education. Their unfamiliarity with this particular pedagogy, or the lack of its implementation in their language lessons, could perhaps explain this finding.

Table 1. The mean and overall scores of effective L2 pedagogies beliefs amongst TESL and Mathematics students according to dimensions

Dimension (D)		TESL Students		Mathematics Students	
		Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD
6	Highlights Learner-centred Models	5.03	.677	4.22	.562
5	Teaches Metacognitive Skills	4.87	.940	4.13	.550
2	Emphasises Project and Problem-based Learning	4.87	.627	4.25	.567
8	Assesses for Deeper Understanding & Competency	4.65	.580	4.21	.540
1	Customises Learning	4.59	.754	4.13	.588
3	Cultivates Creativity and Innovation	4.44	.751	3.91	.622
4	Employs Appropriate Learning Tools & Promotes Learning without Borders (Strategic questioning, use of mobile technologies & social media)	4.37	.753	4.31	.670
7.	Recognises Learning through Open Education	3.02	.893	3.06	.862
Overall Mean Score		4.50	.467	4.04	.374

*1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Partially disagree, 4=Partially agree, 5=Agree, 6=Strongly agree

Overall, Table 1 illustrates that TESL students agreed more on the most effective L2 pedagogies than Mathematics students. In other words, TESL students have higher levels of belief in most selected dimensions as useful for their L2 development. Based on each dimension's mean scores, TESL students were found to have the highest mean score in Dimension 6 (Highlights Learner-centred Models). In contrast, Mathematics students had the highest mean score in Dimension 4 (Employs Appropriate Learning Tools and Promotes Learning without Borders). Therefore, it can be concluded that the TESL students agreed most on learner-centred learning, while the Mathematics students agreed most on employing appropriate learning tools (strategic questioning, mobile technologies, and social media) as the most effective L2 pedagogies.

Independent sample T-Test was used to determine the significant difference in TESL and Mathematics students' overall mean scores in effective L2 pedagogies (Table 2). The comparison between TESL and Mathematics students' overall mean scores revealed a significant difference in the sig(2-tailed) value below 0.05 for the two groups' L2 pedagogies beliefs, as shown below.

Table 2. Independent samples T-Test comparing the overall mean scores for the TESL and Mathematics students' beliefs of effective L2 pedagogies

Group	N	Total Mean Score	SD	T	df	Sig (2-tailed)
TESL	30	4.50	.467	4.221	58	<.05
Mathematics	30	4.04	.374			

*significant at 0.05 level

TESL and Mathematics students' mean scores in the selected dimensions of effective L2 pedagogies were also compared (Table 3). The analysis yielded sig(2-tailed) values below 0.05 for dimensions 1,2,3,5,6, and 8, indicating significant differences between TESL and Mathematics students in their mean scores for these dimensions. However, sig(2-tailed) values above 0.05 were retrieved for dimensions 4 and 7, signifying the absence of a significant difference in the two groups' mean scores in the two dimensions.

Table 3. Independent samples T-Test comparing the mean scores of TESL and Mathematics students' beliefs of effective L2 pedagogies based on dimensions

No	Dimension	TESL (n=30)		Mathematics (n=30)		T	df	Sig (2-tailed)
		Mean Score	SD	Mean Score	SD			
1	Customises Learning	4.59	.754	4.13	.588	2.635	58	<.05
2	Emphasises Project and Problem-based Learning	4.87	.627	4.25	.567	3.981	58	<.05
3	Cultivates Creativity and Innovation	4.44	.751	3.91	.622	2.997	58	<.05
4	Employs Appropriate Learning Tools & Promotes Learning without Borders	4.37	.753	4.31	.670	.362	58	>.05
5	Teaches Metacognitive Skills	4.87	.940	4.13	.550	3.689	56	<.05
6	Highlights Learner-centred Models	5.03	.677	4.22	.562	5.065	58	<.05
7	Recognises Learning through Open Education	3.02	.893	3.07	.862	-.206	58	>.05
8	Assesses for Deeper Understanding & Competency	4.65	.580	4.21	.538	3.046	58	<.05
	Total Mean Score	4.50		4.04		4.221	58	<.05

*significant at 0.05 level

The mean score of each item in all the dimensions of effective L2 pedagogies beliefs is shown in Table 4. The sig(2-tailed) values below 0.05 were obtained for 26 items, whereas the sig(2-tailed) values higher than 0.05 were yielded for the other (17) items. This

shows the significant differences in the mean scores for the majority (26) items. Similarly, the independent samples T-Test also indicated the significant differences in TESL and Mathematic students' overall mean scores, i.e., TESL students had a higher mean score (Mean=4.50, SD=.467) compared to their Mathematics counterparts (Mean=4.04, SD=.374). In the context of language acquisition, the earlier group of students generally agreed more that the 21st century L2 pedagogies are useful for their L2 development.

Table 4. Independent samples T-Test comparing the mean scores of TESL and Mathematics students' beliefs in effective L2 pedagogies based on items.

Item	Dimension	TESL (n=30)		Mathematics (n=30)		T	Df	Sig (2-tailed)
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
	I believe that my lecturer ...							
	Dimension 1: Customises Learning							
1.1	captures information about his/her learners' aptitudes and progress.	4.50	1.137	4.03	.615	1.977	58	>.05
1.2	cultivates learners' individual sense of wonder.	4.77	.817	3.97	.809	3.811	58	<.05
1.3	inspires us to explore different applications for knowledge and skills.	4.77	.817	4.20	.847	2.637	58	<.05
1.4	customises lessons to reach learners individually.	4.33	.994	4.27	.640	.309	58	>.05
1.5	customises lessons based on learners' individual sense of wonder.	4.57	1.165	4.17	.699	1.613	58	>.05
	Total	*4.59*	*.754*	*4.13*	*.588*	*2.635*	*58*	*<.05*
	Dimension 2: Emphasises Project- and Problem-based Learning							
2.1	emphasises on the language skills to face future challenges.	4.70	1.119	4.03	.850	2.598	54	<.05
2.2	emphasises on having control over our learning.	4.87	.629	4.13	.819	3.889	58	<.05
2.3	emphasises on having responsibility for our learning.	4.90	.662	4.33	1.061	2.482	58	<.05
2.4	assigns project-based learning activities to match our styles and preferences.	4.67	.959	4.30	.651	1.733	51	>.05
2.5	uses real-world contexts in his/her teaching.	5.03	.928	4.33	.606	3.459	50	<.05
2.6	uses problem-based learning in his/her teaching.	4.97	.809	4.30	.596	3.635	53	<.05
2.7	uses problem-based learning activities to improve learners' academic performance.	4.93	.828	4.33	.547	3.313	50	<.05
	Total	*4.87*	*.627*	*4.25*	*.567*	*3.981*	*58*	*<.05*
	Dimension 3: Cultivates Creativity and Innovation							
3.1	cultivates creativity during his/her teaching.	4.40	.855	3.83	.791	2.664	58	<.05
3.2	cultivates innovation during his/her teaching.	4.10	.923	3.73	.785	1.658	57	>.05
3.3	recognises creative capability in ourselves.	4.43	.935	4.20	.551	1.177	58	>.05
3.4	recognises innovative capability in ourselves.	4.40	.932	3.93	.640	2.261	58	<.05
3.5	encourages us to be creative in his/her teaching.	4.80	.714	4.07	.740	3.906	58	<.05
3.6	encourages us to be innovative in his/her teaching.	4.53	.900	3.70	.750	3.898	58	<.05
	Total	*4.44*	*.751*	*3.91*	*.622*	*2.997*	*58*	*<.05*
	Dimension 4: Employs Appropriate Learning Tools & Promotes Learning without Borders (strategic questioning, use of mobile technologies & social media)							
4.1	employs probing questions to foster curiosity.	5.00	.871	4.03	1.033	3.918	56	<.05
4.2	employs mobile technologies to improve learning.	4.07	1.143	4.57	.858	-1.916	54	>.05
4.3	employs mobile devices in classroom settings for educational purposes (e.g., learn independently and access supplementary materials and resources easily).	4.43	.971	4.47	1.074	-.126	57	>.05
4.4	integrates social media and technologies into his/her teaching.	3.63	1.189	3.53	.860	.373	53	>.05
4.5	employs various sources (e.g., internet webpages, books, journals, etc.) to promote learning without borders	4.73	1.081	4.93	.828	-.805	54	>.05
	Total	*4.37*	*.753*	*4.31*	*.670*	*.362*	*58*	*>.05*
	Dimension 5: Teaches Metacognitive Skills							
5.1	teaches us to ask questions in order to facilitate learning.	4.93	1.048	4.20	.610	3.311	58	<.05
5.2	teaches us to give explicit instructions that strengthen individual's judgment.	4.83	.986	3.83	.834	4.243	56	<.05
5.3	teaches us to give explicit instructions that concern our learning.	4.87	1.042	4.07	.583	3.670	58	<.05
5.4	teaches us to give explicit instructions to make more informed learning choices	4.83	1.020	4.20	.610	2.919	58	<.05
5.5	designs lessons that include reflection into teaching.	4.87	.860	4.37	.556	2.673	58	<.05
	Total	*4.87*	*.940*	*4.13*	*.550*	*3.689*	*56*	*<.05*
	Dimension 6: Highlights Learner-centred Models							
6.1	emphasises on learners taking responsibility for own learning.	5.07	.785	4.37	.490	4.143	48	<.05
6.2	highlights self-regulated learning among students.	4.90	.759	4.30	.466	3.690	58	<.05
6.3	highlights independent work amongst students.	4.97	.850	4.20	.484	4.291	46	<.05
6.4	highlights exploration for new understanding.	5.13	.681	3.97	.850	5.864	55	<.05

Meanwhile, the mean scores for dimensions 1,2,3,5,6, and 8 were also significantly different between TESL and Mathematics students; however, this is not the case for the mean scores attained for dimensions 4 and 7. Thus, it is obvious that TESL and Mathematics students had different levels of belief for the items in dimensions 1,2,3,5,6, and 8 as effective L2 pedagogies. In particular, TESL students perceive that L2 pedagogies which cultivate their sense of wonder (Mean=4.77, SD=.817) and inspire them to explore different applications for knowledge and skills (Mean=4.77, SD=.817) as important for lecturers to consider in customising lessons (dimension 1) for them. However, this high level of belief was not shared by their Mathematics counterparts (Mean=4.77, SD=.817) for the earlier item and (Mean=4.20, SD=.847) for the latter item, respectively. For the items in dimension 2, it is interesting to note TESL students' high regard for L2 pedagogies that incorporate the use of real-world contexts (Mean=5.03, SD=.928) and problem-based learning (Mean=4.97, SD=.809) as effective compared to Mathematics students who scored lower for both (Mean=4.33, SD=.606, and Mean=4.30, SD=.596 respectively).

The same group of students also see the importance of L2 pedagogies that cultivate creativity and innovation (dimension 3), as indicated by their scores for the items (encourage creativity: Mean=4.80, SD=.714) and (encourage innovation: Mean=4.53, SD=.900). Mathematics students had lower scores for these items (cultivates creativity: Mean=3.93, SD=.640 / encourages innovation: Mean=4.07, SD=.740). TESL students generally scored higher than their Mathematics counterpart for dimension 5, which includes items relating to pedagogies that encourage them to ask questions, give explicit instructions for strengthening individual judgement, explicit instructions that concern their learning, explicit instructions that enable them to make informed learning choices and lessons that incorporate reflection. TESL students also had firmer belief in L2 pedagogies that enable them to get feedback, encourage peer assessment activities, show their ability to learn how to learn, as well as enable to reflect on their learning and competency, as reflected in their higher mean scores for each item in dimension 8.

Table 4. Independent samples T-Test comparing the mean scores of TESL and Mathematics students' beliefs in effective L2 pedagogies based on items (cont...)

Item	Dimension	TESL (n=30)		Mathematics (n=30)		T	Df	Sig (2-tailed)
	I believe that my lecturer ...	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
6.5	highlights learner-centred model than teacher-centred learning in the classroom.	5.10	.803	4.27	.868	3.859	58	<.05
	Total	*5.03*	*.677*	*4.22*	*.562*	*5.065*	*58*	*<.05*
Dimension 7: Recognises Learning through Open Education								
7.1	uses Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) in teaching.	2.80	1.126	2.73	1.202	.222	58	>.05
7.2	uses iLearn in teaching.	2.80	1.270	2.97	1.033	-.557	56	>.05
7.3	uses Learning Management Systems (LMS) in teaching.	2.63	1.033	2.80	1.215	-.572	57	>.05
7.4	uses e-Learning in teaching.	3.30	1.088	3.33	.922	-.128	56	>.05
7.5	uses blended learning in teaching.	3.57	.935	3.50	.731	.308	55	>.05
	Total	*3.02*	*.893*	*3.07*	*.862*	*-.206*	*58*	*>.05*
Dimension 8: Assesses for Deeper Understanding and Competency								
8.1	gives feedback to the students after marking assignments.	4.30	1.022	4.10	.662	.900	58	>.05
8.2	encourages peer assessment activities in class.	4.57	1.165	4.30	.794	1.036	51	>.05
8.3	designs lessons that show our ability to learn how to learn.	4.77	.626	4.30	.750	2.617	56	<.05
8.4	designs lessons to enable us reflect on our learning.	4.87	.730	4.20	.551	3.992	54	<.05
8.5	designs lessons to enable us to reflect on our competency.	4.77	.679	4.17	.531	3.814	55	<.05
	Total	*4.65*	*.589*	*4.04*	*.540*	*3.046*	*58*	*>.05*
	Overall Mean Scores	**4.50**	**.467**	**4.04**	**.374**	**4.221**	**58**	**<.05**

As previously stated, both groups had similar levels of belief for the items in dimension 4 and 7. The items in dimension 4 include the use of L2 pedagogies that allow students to ask questions to foster curiosity, use mobile technologies and devices, supplementary materials and resources, and use social media and technologies in teaching and learning. L2 pedagogies in dimension 7 include the use of MOOC, iLearn, LMS, e-learning, and blended learning. Generally, the significant differences in TESL and Mathematics students' mean scores indicated the earlier group had a higher level of belief in most items in the dimensions as effective L2 pedagogies than the latter group who had lower levels of belief in most items of the selected dimensions.

To support the quantitative data and for triangulation purposes, interview results were also included to generate more enriched responses. The responses were qualitatively analysed in search of possible effective language pedagogies for students' L2 development based on their perspectives on other classroom activities they strongly feel their language instructors should incorporate to help them acquire the target language. Among the suggestions was the inclusion of technology, as stated by a TESL respondent.

"Lecturers should use ICT and media in their lessons".

Another TESL respondent also indicated the same idea;

"Teachers should consider integrating more social media into their lessons because they are part of our everyday life now."

It is interesting to note how incorporating technology is associated with effective L2 learning, emphasising the use of social media as a practical language pedagogy. The suggestion to include technology and social media in the classroom was concurred by a Mathematic student who responded;

"Language learning can be more effective with the use of social media in learning."

Even though the above responses lack elaboration on how technology and social media could lead to adequate mastery of L2, they seemed to strongly support the inclusion of technology and social media in the classroom as an effective way for more enriched experiences in L2 acquisition. Another TESL student supporting the use of social media in language classroom gave more elaborated feedback;

"They can communicate with us more via social media platforms. I am aware many lecturers are not keen on the idea of communicating too frequently outside of the classroom as they are very busy and to avoid over-dependence of students on them.

113

However, if there is a formal social media platform online with an easy and quick interface (unlike tedious iLearn), such as an app for lecturers and students to communicate with healthy boundaries, it would be great. It is not too intimate such as Whatsapp, while also not too broadcasted online to the point if there is something wrong. The conversation will go viral like on Twitter. A fine balance between these two applications would be nice. The most important part is the interface of the technology must be easy to use."

The respondent advocates the use of social media as a useful tool to learn L2. However, the respondent also warned that there should be limitations set whenever social media is used in lessons, i.e., the social platform should be appropriately utilised, i.e., not to divert them from its primary purpose of language learning. Besides incorporating technology (mainly social media) into L2 classrooms, there are also calls for collaborative learning approaches in English classes. One Mathematics respondent suggested using "collaborative teaching" as she perceived that her acquisition of L2 would be more effective if her lecturer uses collaborative learning. This statement was also agreed by a TESL respondent who proposed;

"Use more online collaborative activities, preferably online games like Kahoot! because it can excite students to compete with one another in groups during class".

The above highlights the belief in incorporating collaborative learning like online games to instigate interest, inject excitement and encourage students' interactions through group activities. Sharing the same view on online games and collaborative learning, another TESL respondent stated;

"Use online games and create activities that are available online. Lecturers should conduct more lessons using the 21st-century learning style such as live online class."

The respondent also recommended using online classes as a method to facilitate L2 learning. This remark is expected as online classes are regarded as a form of collaborative learning method that also allows discussion other than the face-to-face one that requires them to be physically in the classroom. Other than that, another TESL respondent proposed using "jigsaw classroom" as another effective pedagogy to be implemented. Jigsaw classroom refers to an activity that requires learners to work in groups; each group interchangeably elaborates on the contents of discussion in their original group to members of the new group they are assigned in. This "jigsaw classroom" is a collaborative method or learning strategy that puts learners to work with each other. Another response by a Mathematics respondent briefly suggests "making class more fun" but with no further elaboration on how this could be materialised through the use of a particular activity or a specific teaching method and thus, making the suggestion rather challenging to scrutinise.

4.0 Discussion

The implementation of modern technology has given educators more choices in teaching approaches and enabled learners to retrieve information relating to their studies quickly. This easiness has indirectly led to learner-centred approach and more independent learning on the part of learners, particularly those in higher learning institutions. In relation to this, Badjadi (2020) stated that globalised approaches in education are gaining popularity and are now adopted in the blueprints for educational reforms that call for updated instructional practices and a shift towards learner-centredness. In this study, TESL students perceive the pedagogies that emphasise the learner-centred model as effective for their L2 acquisition. This finding is similar to what Caganaga (2014) reported, i.e., English language learners at the University of Cyprus preferred a learner-centred model in classrooms. The preference for and implementation of the learner-centred model among high school students was reported by Endang (2018), who emphasised that varied mediums and teaching approaches must be provided to encourage cooperative and independent learning and that "the teacher is not the only source of learning."

The fact that TESL students have voiced out their preferences for a learner-centred model indicates their readiness to take up more challenges, responsibilities, and willingness for more independent roles and exploration for a new understanding in learning. Hence, language instructors must support these by providing activities that encourage the preferred roles. Jacobs and Toh-Heng (2013) suggested activities that involve learners searching for and adding information, pair or group tasks, active participation in discussion, peer and self-assessment, use of examples based on learners' interest and environment, individual reflection, sharing of knowledge gained with peers, learners' creation of visuals based on critical ideas, mutual respect between teachers and learners and among themselves as fulfilling the requirements of the learner-centred model. Thus, based on the finding of learners' perception of effective language pedagogies, implementation of classroom activities of this nature could boost their L2 acquisition. In particular, TESL students' higher preferences for L2 pedagogies that cultivate their sense of wonder and inspire them to explore different applications for knowledge and skills in the lessons customised for them, as in D3 and D1, respectively.

Even though Mathematics students perceived language pedagogies that incorporate appropriate learning tools and learning without borders, such as strategic questioning, mobile technologies and devices, as well as social media and various sources as effective in L2 learning, their preference is closely related to the fact that these pedagogies give them the opportunities to learn independently and put them in close contact with their language instructor, peers, and others. Easy access to information in various

sources, borderless learning, and unlimited communications with others are made possible through mobile technologies and other devices, as well as online platforms such as social media. These possibilities are explained by Beetham and Sharpe who indicated that although (appropriate learning tools like) mobile technologies do not determine the educational setting and informal learning, when placed in a social and cultural setting, they can affect how "people learn, and therefore make for effective learning and effective pedagogy" (2007, p. 6). In this study, Mathematics students, whose course learning contents are different from TESL or other programmes, preferred different pedagogies for their L2 learning.

The learning approaches that work effectively for them in other subjects might be the basis for their pedagogical preferences in mastering the English language. Hashemia, Azizinezhad, Najafia, Nesari (2011) concluded that "if language learners' preferences and needs can be allowed to have a bearing on what is learned and how, (mobile) technologies have a clear role to play" as learners are taken outside of the classroom, highlighting the necessity to consider learners' needs and preferences for language learning. For this reason, language practitioners must acknowledge the differences and choose teaching methods that match the learners' needs and preferences. To fulfil this warrants more considerations, as this requires equipping language educators with the relevant technological and pedagogical skills to help learners acquire good English language proficiency by integrating learner-centred activities for TESL students and suitable learning tools like mobile technologies and social media for Mathematics students. The incorporation of learning tools is not new in language education. These modern devices have not only shaped the way teaching and learning are conducted today, but they have also paved the way for borderless learning to take place from anywhere and at any time, both in formal and informal settings.

The use of social media was also (among) the most preferred activities by both TESL and Mathematics students. However, this result contradicts that of Tsai (2016), who discovered a higher preference for printed texts (over electronic text) for reading by the English-major students in her study. Both TESL and Mathematics respondents of the current work indicated preferences for appropriate tools to facilitate L2 acquisition. Based on this finding, it is suggested that language practitioners integrate social media into their lessons, as highly preferred by students majoring in English and other students to facilitate their language development.

Bada and Okan (2000) stated that effective language teaching and learning would occur when teachers fully understand learners' varied learning needs, capabilities, potentials, and preferences. There are several highlights in the current work. First and foremost, the findings suggest a close collaboration between the language instructor and learners to fully understand their needs and their capabilities and potentials in meeting those needs and other relevant input. Second, language educators must consider adjusting their language lessons by integrating L2 pedagogies that students perceive as the best for their language acquisition. The differences in what learners perceive as effective L2 pedagogies should serve as guidelines for language practitioners to incorporate pedagogies that are best suited for their needs. Third, using L2 pedagogies that are specifically tailored to meet the needs of 21st century learners is crucial for the successful attainment of language skills and development of other skills necessary for employability (Bharathi, 2016). These can only be attained through the collaboration of both language practitioners; the earlier to continuously search for relevant pedagogies to facilitate learners' proficiency and the latter by giving input of what works best for their language development. In searching for the most suitable L2 pedagogies, however, the selection must be made tactfully. TESL and Mathematics respondents indicated that the use of open education such as MOOC, blended learning, and e-Learning in the context of this study would not help improve their language proficiency. The finding of Bahri's (2016) work, on the contrary, indicated otherwise; his respondents were more receptive towards the use of blended learning in enhancing their English proficiency. TESL and Mathematics students' rather unpleasant experiences in using open education sources could be due to several factors. First, open education sources at this University are still at the initial stages, while some are changing. Second, although these platforms' implementation is university-wide, they may or may not be fully utilised by all lecturers and students. Hence, it can be expected that TESL and Mathematics students are still not familiar with the use. Consequently, these sources must be fully utilised for learners' benefits, particularly in learning English. This study has discerned and given a clear picture of what L2 learners perceive as effective pedagogies and the teaching methods to be incorporated for a positive development of L2.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

This research work investigated what students perceive as effective L2 pedagogies. Several findings have shed light on the pedagogies that are regarded as effective (or not effective) for L2 acquisition. TESL students perceived the learner-centred model as effective for L2 learning; in contrast, Mathematics students opted for appropriate tools in learning the English language. Nonetheless, to make the learner-centred model effective in L2 teaching and learning, it must be carefully adapted by considering the complexities of human and pragmatic aspects, which differ in varied learning environments (Tudor, 1992). Therefore, both language instructors and learners share the responsibilities in ensuring that the various language needs are identified and customising activities that fulfil these needs. Although findings yielded highlight several pertinent information, this study is somewhat restricted in several ways. The small number of respondents from merely two programmes (TESL and Mathematics) limits the generalisation of the findings to the University's entire population.

Therefore, more significant and well-balanced samples of respondents from various faculties must be used to generate more enriched data. Based on the findings, some suggestions are also given for future studies. The inclusion of (more) respondents from other programmes and faculties would generate more detailed and accurate results that portray their preferred pedagogies for effective L2 acquisition. Conducting a study at other higher learning institutions might also yield a tremendous amount of information

necessary for language practitioners to formulate lessons that incorporate effective strategies for L2 learning. Extending similar studies to schools will allow retrieval of rich data and identify the best tools to assist L2 learners in mastering the English language at an earlier learning stage.

Acknowledgement

References

Abdul Kadir, K., & Wan Mohd Noor, W. S. (2015). Students' Awareness of the Importance of English Language Proficiency with Regard to Future Employment. *World Review of Business Research*.

Bada, E. & Okan, Z. (2000). Students' language learning preferences. *The electronic journal of teaching of English as a second or foreign language, 4*(3). http://www.teslej.org/wordpress/issues/volume4/ej15/ej15a1/

Badjadi, N. E. (2020). Learner-Centered English Language Teaching: Premises, Practices, and Prospects. *IAFOR Journal of Education: Language Learning in Education, 8*(1), *8-27.*

Beetham, H. & Sharpe, R. (Eds.) (2007). *Rethinking Pedagogy for a Digital Age: Designing and Delivering E-Learning.* London: Routledge

Bahri, N. (2016). *Investigating the Impacts of Blended Learning on Learning English*.

Bharathi, A. V. (2016). *Communication Skills–Core of Employability Skills: Issues and Concerns*.

Endang, D. (2018). Learner-centred teaching: What makes it effective. *Indonesian EFL Journal, 4*(1), 34-42. Retrieved 10 February 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322892837

Fong, L. L., Sidhu, K. G., & Fook, Y. C. (2014). Exploring 21st century skills among postgraduates in Malaysia. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences.*

Hashemia, M., Azizinezhad, M., Najafia, V., & Nesari, A.J. (2011). What is Mobile Learning? Challenges and Capabilities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30*, 2477 – 2481

Jacobs, G. M., & Toh-Heng, H. L. (2013). Small steps towards student-centred learning. In P. Mandal (Ed.), Proceedings of the international conference on managing the Asian century (pp. 55-64). Singapore: Springer.

Jacobson-Lundeberg, V. (2009). *Pedagogical Implementation of 21st Century Skills*.

Johnson, S. S. (2014). *21st Century Transformation: A Holistic Pedagogical Approach*.

Kanokpermpoon, M. (2012). *21st Century Language Learning and Teaching: Implementation of ICT-Oriented Language Education*.

Kashef, S. H., Khorasani, R., & Zahabi, A. (2014). Investigating the Effect of a Learning-Centered Instruction on Non-English Major Students' Attitudes towards English Course. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*.

Leggat, P. (2015). *Modern Learning Environments, 21st Century Learning & Curriculum, and Future Focused Learning*.

Munoz, A. J. (2015). *Content and Language: The Impact of Pedagogical Designs on Academic Performance within Tertiary English as a Medium of Instruction*.

Murphy, P. (2008). Defining pedagogy. In K. Hall, P. Murphy & J. Soler (Eds.), *Pedagogy and practice: Culture and identities* (pp. 28-39). London: SAGE Publication.

Nair, G. K., Abdul Rahim, R., Setia, R., Husin, N., Sabapathy, E., Abd Jalil, N. A., et al. (2012). Malaysian Graduates English Adequacy in Job Sector. *Asian Social Science*.

National Graduate Employability Blueprint 2012-2017, Malaysia.

Scarino, A., Kohler, M., & Benedetti, A. (2016). *Investigating Pedagogies for Language-and-Culture Learning*.

Ibrahim, N.G., Kamariah A.B., & Othman T. (2013). Gender Analysis of Critical Thinking Disposition Instrument among University Putra Malaysia undergraduate students. *Recent Technological Advances in Education*. Retrieved 20 March 2017 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251231930

Scott, C. L. (2015). *The Futures of Learning 3: What Kind of Pedagogies for the 21st century?* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.

Tudor, I. (1992). Learner-centredness in language teaching: Finding the right balance. *System, 20*(1), 31-44. Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(92)90005-NGet rights and content