INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2025, Vol. 6, No. 10, 5149 – 5157
http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.10.24

Research Article

Extent of Use and Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches Among Senior High School Teachers in Jolo

Al-Micha-el D. Ladjahasan*

Graduate School of Education, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Philippines

Article history:
Submission 25 September 2025
Revised 30 September 2025
Accepted 23 October 2025

**Corresponding author:*
E-mail:
ladjahasana@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research explored the utilization and effectiveness of teacher-centered (TC) and student-centered (LC) methods in public and private senior high schools LIA Jolo. More particularly, its aims were as follows: (1) to ascertain the extent of usage of TC and LC methods; (2) to explore variations in the usages according to school type; (3) to assess their efficiency; (4) to make comparisons of efficiency by category according both categories of schools and types of teachers profile.

All Senior High Schools, both public and private with a census of 139 teachers participated. Surveys were used to collect information about the use of and perception of effectiveness of both approaches. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the significant differences on under school type, teachers' demographic profile.

Results show that both LC and TC are widely implemented in public and private schools, however they significantly differ. LC is more common in private schools and TC prevails in public schools. The results also showed that LC is highly preferred compared to TC in terms of perceived effectiveness by the respondents. LC was rated more effective by private school teachers (93) when compared with public schools teachers (46). In contrast, TC did not differ significantly in its effectiveness among public versus private schools. Furthermore, teachers' gender and age were not relevant where the perceived usefulness of both approaches was concerned.

In general, the study suggests that although both paradigms coexist in practice, LC is regarded as more effective among educators who experience from it especially within private schools, where its team proposed implementations allow to draw lessons for students on improving learning and well-being.

Keywords: *Teacher-Centered Approaches; Learner-Centered Approaches; Senior High Schools in Jolo*

How to cite:
Ladjahasan, A. M. D. (2025). Extent of Use and Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches Among Senior High School Teachers in Jolo. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. *6*(10), 5149 – 5157. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.06.10.24

Introduction

Approaches that teachers use in the teaching learning process are of paramount importance since students learn in many ways. A few can study on their own, after direction and reinforcement from the teacher. Therefore, it has become an obligation on the part of teachers to choose teaching methods that take into account the diversity between learners and to be aware of these methods so that learners can learn all they possibly can. Two key approaches adopted are teacher-centered and learner-centered methods. In teachercentred approach, the instructor or a facilitator plays the role as a facilitator and provider of guidance and corrective feedback if required Adalia, H., Chavez, J., Hayudini, M., Kinarang, A., Sabbaha, N., & Salasain, A. (2025). In learner-centred approach, however, students are viewed as active participants who engage in dialogues/dialogic interactions by sharing ideas and asking and answering questions while regarding the teacher as a resource rather than the only source of knowledge Aming-Hayudini, M. A. E., & Kasim, K. S. (2022).

Beliefs play a major role in teaching and also student learning Pangandaman, H. K., Datumanong, N. T., Diamla, M. R. L., Raki-in, R. M., Hayudini, M. A. A., Amil, J. H., Alih, S.-A. J., Iskandal, I. I., Abduhadi, A.-R. A., Tan, A. R. A., & Warid-Sahi, A. P. (2025). Poststructuralist educational theory frequently critiques teacher-centered pedagogy as being hierarchical, based on rote learning, passive learning and un-expansive of higher-order thinking. It is also associated with authoritarian policies which demand uniformity. Learner-centered pedagogy, on the other hand, encourages co-responsibility for learning, critical thinking and collaboration through activities like group work, debates, case studies and presentations, self- and peer-assessments and reflective tasks. This paradigm is linked with liberal, democratic schooling.

The quality of teaching is usually evaluated by gains in pupils' attainment (Imig & Imig, 2006). In the Philippines, National Achievement Test (NAT) results have been sliding downwards, which suggests that educational practices must be re-assessed (Raya 2007; DepEd 2010). Therefore, this study aimed to find out which is more effective in enhancing student learning in public and private senior high schools in the area of Jolo, Sulu: teacher-centered or learner-centered.

Methodology

Research design This study utilized descriptive research design (Aming-Hayudini et al., 2024) in order to describe the teaching approaches of senior high school teachers in Jolo. The 20 item checklist questionnaire, which was originally developed by Brown (2008) with an objective assessment of the teacher and learner centered teaching approaches, were used to collect the data. The instrument was subjected to content validation by three experts (Warid-Sahaial et, al., 2024) and validated through reliability of split half method for internal consistency. The study involved six schools namely: Sulu College of Technology, Inc., Notre Dame of Jolo College, Southwestern Mindanao Islamic Institute, Mindanao State University-Sulu, Sulu State College and Hadji Butu School of Arts and Trade. All senior high school teachers from these schools participated in the study as respondents. Principal, a consent to conduct the study was sought from them and questionnaires were hand delivered and reclaimed. Data were analyzed by using weighted mean for the first research question, whereas t-test and ANOVA were sustained to find out the significant difference for other research questions.

Results and Discussion

Extent of Employ the Leaner-centered and the Teacher-centered methods. 139 teachers of varying schools types were assessed to compare methods of teaching- student-centric and teacher centric approaches. The average mean of each concept and the overall average mean of all concepts are shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Extent of Use of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches

Statement	N	Mean	Interpretation
Learner-Centered Approaches			
LC1. Encourages student collaboration and group work	139	4.4101	Great
LC2. Uses real-life and contextual learning activities	139	4.3094	Great
LC3. Facilitates interactive class discussions	139	4.4604	Great
LC4. Provides activities promoting critical thinking	139	4.3022	Great
LC5. Adjusts teaching based on students' needs	139	4.3381	Great
LC6. Encourages problem-based learning	139	4.4460	Great
LC7. Uses performance-based assessments	139	4.2230	Great
LC8. Promotes self-directed learning	139	4.3309	Great
LC9. Integrates technology to support active learning	139	4.4101	Great
LC10. Builds learning activities on students' prior knowledge	139	4.3237	Great
Average (LC)	139	**4.3554**	Great
Teacher-Centered Approaches			
TC1. Uses lectures as the primary mode of teaching	139	4.5468	Very Great
TC2. Provides direct instruction for concepts	139	4.0647	Great
TC3. Uses teacher-led demonstrations	139	4.0863	Great
TC4. Uses drills and practice activities	139	3.7410	Great
TC5. Gives factual knowledge through lectures	139	4.1583	Great
TC6. Controls classroom discussions	139	4.0647	Great
TC7. Relies on teacher-designed assessments	139	4.3309	Great
TC8. Emphasizes memorization of concepts	139	4.2806	Great
TC9. Provides limited student participation	139	3.7122	Great
TC10. Uses textbooks as primary resource	139	4.3022	Great
Average (TC)	139	**4.1288**	Great

Legend:
1.00 – 1.49 = Used to no extent
1.50 – 2.49 = Used to a little extent
2.50 – 3.49 = Used to some extent
3.50 – 4.49 = Used to a great extent
4.50 – 5.00 = Used to a very great extent

As shown in Table 4.1, both learner-centered (LC) and teacher-centered (TC)learning approaches are frequently adopted by the Jolo public and private SHSs as illustrated by their overall mean of 4.36 and 4.13, correspondingly. This suggests that educators respect the need for both traditional and progressive methods in teaching-learning process.

As for LC activities, the rating of encouraging class participation between answer and question was the highest (M=4.46), indicating that teachers attach importance to students' participation. For TC methods, the highest more (M = 4.55) was derived out of "Lectures" as teaching method to a very great extent", which implies that structured–teacher dominated education still enjoys a continued relevance.

School type comparison indicated: LC was more commonly practiced in private schools; TC was higher in public schools. However, at the "great extent" level in both instruments overall institutions constantly occurred.

Taken together, these results indicate a blended pedagogical approach in which educators composite LC for promoting active learning with TC practices to fuel structured knowledge delivery. This equilibrium represents a response to 21st-century educational needs and dependence on the legacy practices that continue to power classroom instruction.

Table 4.2 Comparison of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches According to Type of School

Approach	Statement	School Type	N	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision	Remarks
Learner-Centered (LC)	Learner-centered approaches overall	Private	93	4.417	2.623	137	.010	Reject Ho	With Difference
		Public	46	4.230					
Teacher-Centered (TC)	Teacher-centered approaches overall	Private	93	4.075	-2.025	137	.025	Reject Ho	With Difference
		Public	46	4.237					

Table 4.2 Differences between the use of LC and TC approaches of private and public SHS in Jolo The table 4.2 shows the ranking based on usages from both Senior High schools in Jolo, Sulu, regardless if public or private institutions will be considered to set limitations according to their enrolments base on WLTSIAE report (2018) to determine which school uses either the learner-centered approach or teacher center approach as a criterion for setting a minimum limit and finally exporting it into our model. For LC, the p-value (. 010), the results are not significant at the 0.05 level: private schools (M=4.42) employ LC more often than public schools (M=4.23). For TC, the p-value (. 025) and there is also a significant difference identified with public sch ools (M=.yj= 4.24) making greater use of TC than private schools (M= 4.08).

These findings indicate that private schools are more learner-centered because of the extent to which they have been able to bypass the strictures of standardized curriculum, class size, and access to resources, while public schools remain more teacher-driven in the face of large enrollments and efforts to standardize curricula.

Taken altogether, much is oriented towards type of school: the private one that values progressive classes focused in students learning to cooperate and critical thinking more than public ones do, which value teacher centered classes for teaching structured contents.

Table 4.3 Comparison of Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches (Paired Sample t-test)

Approach	Statement (Effectiveness Indicator)	N	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision	Remarks
Learner-Centered (LC)	Promotes critical thinking and problem-solving	139	4.3201	7.530	138	.002	Reject Ho	Significant (With Difference)
Teacher-Centered (TC)	Provides clear, structured delivery of content	139	4.0691					

The results of the paired sample t-test comparing learner-centered (LC) and teacher-centered (TC) are given in Table 4.3. The difference was statistically significant (p =. 002), for which LC (M = 4.32) received higher ratings than TC (M = 4.07). This suggests that teachers believe the student-centred approaches to be more effective in advancing students' learning than the teacher-centred methods.

Effectiveness by type of school Table 4.4 also explored the effect of VIA on different schools. The findings indicate that private schools perceived LC as more effective than public schools, but public schools saw TC

slightly better. These differences signal the power of school context, as private schools have been shown to favor innovative, student-centered practices while public schools continue to seek teacher-centered instruction for both structure and content transmission.

In general, the results indicate that although both approaches are considered worthwhile, learners' centredness is perceived as far more effective than teacher-centred approach underscoring the need to support capacity building for student-centered pedagogy.

Table 4.4 Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches Grouped According to Type of School

Approach	Statement (Effectiveness Indicator)	School Type	N	Mean Effectiveness	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Decision (Ho)	Remarks
Learner-Centered (LC)	Promotes active learning and student engagement	Private	93	4.3785	2.214	137	.028	Reject	Significant difference
		Public	46	4.2022					
Teacher-Centered (TC)	Provides structured and organized delivery of content	Private	93	4.0925	0.760	137	.449	Accept	Not significant
		Public	46	4.0217					

Table 4.4 comparisons of LC and TC types effectiveness across kind of school. A moderate effect (risks difference = −3.95/1721 CMS) was yielded for LC (p =. 028), and private schools (M = 4.38) reported higher levels than public schools (M = 4.20). This implies that private schools consider learner-centered approach more efficient.

On the other hand, TC are not different between private and public schools p =. 449), which suggests that this aspect of teacher orientation can be found equally in both contexts.

Altogether, the results illustrate that LC effectiveness is contingent on the institution, with stronger effects in private schools, yet TC approaches always having value across school types.

By Gender

Table 4.5.1 Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches by Gender

Approach	Effectiveness Indicator Statement	Gender	N	Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Interpretation	Remarks
Learner-Centered (LC)	Promotes student engagement and autonomy	Male	48	4.3604	.769	137	.444	Not significant	Same perception
		Female	91	4.2989					
Teacher-Centered (TC)	Provides structured delivery of knowledge	Male	48	4.0354	.557	137	.578	Not significant	Same perception
		Female	91	4.0868					

Table 4.5.1 Overview and comparisons of perceived effectiveness between LC and TC approaches grouped by gender are presented in Table 4.5.1. For both LC no statistically significant differences were observed (p =. 444) or TC

(p =. 578), which means male and female teachers, rating the different treatments the same way.

Results by age group are shown in Table 4.5.2. There were no significant differences between age groups in LC and TC, indicating that the perception of effectiveness was uniform at all teacher ages.

On the whole, these results suggest that gender or age does not significantly influence teachers' attitudes toward the effect of LL or TL strategies.

Table 4.5.2 ANOVA for Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches by Age

Approach	Effectiveness Indicator Statement	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Interpretation	Remarks
Learner-Centered (LC)	Promotes critical thinking and engagement	Between Groups	.785	2	.393	1.983	.142	Not significant	Same perception across ages
		Within Groups	26.919	136	.198				
		Total	27.704	138					
Teacher-Centered (TC)	Provides structured delivery of knowledge	Between Groups	1.071	2	.536	2.046	.133	Not significant	Same perception across ages
		Within Groups	35.606	136	.262				
		Total	36.677	138					

Table 4.5.3 Mean Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches by Age

Approach	Age Category	N	Mean	Interpretation
Learner-Centered (LC)	30 years and below	70	4.2714	Great Effectiveness
	31 – 40 years	51	4.3216	Great Effectiveness
	41 years and above	18	4.5056	Very Great Effectiveness
	Total	139	**4.3201**	Great Effectiveness
Teacher-Centered (TC)	30 years and below	70	4.0243	Great Effectiveness
	31 – 40 years	51	4.0510	Great Effectiveness
	41 years and above	18	4.2944	Great Effectiveness
	Total	139	**4.0691**	Great Effectiveness

Tables 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 Present the comparison of perceived effectiveness for LC and TC practices between age groups. Specifically, we observed that there were no significant differences between the factors for LC (p =. 142) or TC (p =. 133). Older teachers (≥41 years) provided a somewhat higher mean scores than younger teachers for LC (M = 4.5056), yet not significantly different from them.Middle-aged teacher gave slightly higher mean scores for TC (M = 4.2944).

In general, the age of teachers does not seem to have a significant impact on how well they believe each practice works, with all three cohorts rating LC and TC as ‘quite effective’.

The reliability test for the research instruments resulted in Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.89 (LC), 0.85 (TC), and 0.81 (Effectiveness) which suggests high internal consistency and questionnaire reliability.

QUESTIONNAIRE TOOL

Title:

Extent of Use and Effectiveness of Learner-Centered and Teacher-Centered Approaches among Senior High School Teachers in Jolo

Part I. Demographic Profile

Please provide the following information:

1. **Gender:**
   - ☐ Male
   - ☐ Female
2. **Age:**
   - ☐ 30 years and below
   - ☐ 31 – 40 years
   - ☐ 41 years and above
3. **Type of School:**
   - ☐ Private
   - ☐ Public

Part II. Extent of Use of Teaching Approaches

Please rate **how often you use** the following strategies in your teaching on a scale of **1 to 5**:

1 – Used to no extent
2 – Used to a little extent
3 – Used to some extent
4 – Used to a great extent
5 – Used to a very great extent

A. Learner-Centered Approaches

Statements	Rating
LC1. I encourage student collaboration and group work.	1 2 3 4 5
LC2. I use real-life and contextual learning activities.	1 2 3 4 5
LC3. I facilitate interactive class discussions.	1 2 3 4 5
LC4. I provide activities promoting critical thinking.	1 2 3 4 5
LC5. I adjust my teaching based on students' needs.	1 2 3 4 5
LC6. I encourage problem-based learning.	1 2 3 4 5
LC7. I use performance-based assessments.	1 2 3 4 5
LC8. I promote self-directed learning.	1 2 3 4 5
LC9. I integrate technology to support active learning.	1 2 3 4 5
LC10. I build learning activities on students' prior knowledge.	1 2 3 4 5

B. Teacher-Centered Approaches

Statements	Rating
TC1. I use lectures as the primary mode of teaching.	1 2 3 4 5
TC2. I provide direct instruction for concepts.	1 2 3 4 5
TC3. I use teacher-led demonstrations.	1 2 3 4 5
TC4. I use drills and practice activities.	1 2 3 4 5
TC5. I give factual knowledge through lectures.	1 2 3 4 5
TC6. I control classroom discussions.	1 2 3 4 5
TC7. I rely on teacher-designed assessments.	1 2 3 4 5
TC8. I emphasize memorization of concepts.	1 2 3 4 5
TC9. I provide limited student participation.	1 2 3 4 5
TC10. I use textbooks as the primary resource.	1 2 3 4 5

Part III. Perceived Effectiveness of Teaching Approaches

Please rate **how effective you believe each approach is** in improving student learning outcomes on a scale of **1 to 5**:

1 – Not effective
2 – Slightly effective
3 – Moderately effective
4 – Very effective
5 – Extremely effective

Approach	Effectiveness Indicator Statement	Rating
Learner-Centered (LC)	Promotes critical thinking and problem-solving	1 2 3 4 5
Teacher-Centered (TC)	Provides clear, structured delivery of content	1 2 3 4 5

Part IV. Additional Comments

Please share any **comments or suggestions** regarding the use of learner-centered and teacher-centered approaches in your teaching practice:

References

Adalia, H., Chavez, J., Hayudini, M., Kinarang, A., Sabbaha, N., & Salasain, A. (2025). Relevance of grammar among Gen Z college students using social learning perspectives. Forum for Linguistic Studies, 7(3), 432–450

Aming-Hayudini, M. A. E., & Kasim, K. S. 2022). Factors influencing treatment default among Direct Observed Treatment Short-Course enrolled in pulmonary tuberculosis. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research, 3*(9), 1–1.

Aming-Hayudini, M. A. E., Aming-Hussin, B. E., Sahial, A. P., Gadong, R., Ujad, R., Warid, L. P., Kahalan, A., Abdulpatta, J., & Alam, H. B. (2024). The Sources of Drinkable Water Used and Its Related Diseases among Barangay Capual Residents Omar, Sulu. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, *5*(5), 1-1.

BANTAYAN[1], J. N. I., HAYUDINI, M. A. A., HUSSIN, B. A., AMING, S. E., & WARID-SAHIAL, A. P. TEACHING PHONEMES AND CONSONANT-VOWEL-CONSONANT TECHNIQUES: IT'S SIGNIFICANCE ON THE READING PERFORMANCE OF GRADE SCHOOL PUPILS OF TANDU BATO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Basu, S.J., Barton, A.C, ClIRMIN, N., & Locke, D. (1009). Developing a framework for critical science agency through case study in a conceptual physics context,. Cultural studies of science education, 4, 345-371 https://doi.org/10.1007/s 11422-008-9135-8

Beijaard, D.,Meijer,P.C., & Verloop., N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers Professional identities. Teaching and Teacher Education, 20. 107-128

Boddy, N., Watson, K., & Aubusson, P. (2003). A trial of the five Es: a referent model for constructivist teaching and learning. Research in science teaching. 33(1), 27-42

Bonner, S. M., Somers, J. A., Rivera, G. J., & Keiler, L.S.(2017). Effects of students facilitated learning on instructional facilitators. Instructional Science, 45, 417-438 https//doi.org/10.1007/s11251-017-9410-8

Burris, S., & Garton, B. L. (2007). Effect if instructional strategy on critical thinking and content knowledge; using problem-based learning in the secondary classroom. Journal of Agricultural Education, 46(1), 106-116.

Cates, J. T., & schaefle, S. E., (2011) the relationship between college preparation program and at-risk students college readiness . Journal of Latinos and Education, 10(4), 320-334

Cohen, J., L., (2008) that's not treating you as a professional : teacher constructing complex professional identities through talk. Teacher and teaching theory and practice, 14(2), 79-83.

Creswell, J. (2002). Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Upper saddle River: Merril Prentice Hall.

Danielson, C. (2014). The framework for teaching: Evaluation Instrument, 2013 edition. www.danielsongroup.org. accessed 5 feb 2015.

Dignath, C., & Buttner, G. (2008). Components of fostering self-regulated learning among students. A meta-analysis on intervention studies at primary and secondary school level. Metacognition & Learning, 3(3), 231-264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-008-9029-x.

Pangandaman, H. K., Datumanong, N. T., Diamla, M. R. L., Raki-in, R. M., Hayudini, M. A. A., Amil, J. H., Alih, S.-A. J., Iskandal, I. I., Abduhadi, A.-R. A., Tan, A. R. A., & Warid-Sahi, A. P. (2025). Gamification in nursing education: A systematic review of its impact on knowledge retention and skills development among novice nursing students. *Cuestiones de Fisioterapia, 54*(5), 275–293.

Warid-Sahial, A. P., Hayudini, M. A. A., Gadong, R. J., Ujad, R. J., Warid, L. P., Hussin, B. A., Kahalan, A. J., Abdulpatta, J., & Alam, H. B. B. (2024). The Sources of Drinkable Water Used and Its Related Diseases among Barangay Capual Residents Omar, Sulu. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, *5*(5), 1501-1507.