

Teachers As Facilitators: Their Role In Implementing Student-Centered Teaching Approaches In Indanan South District

Shernalyn A. Ajibun¹, Mary Ann G. Lim

¹ School of Graduate Studies, Sulu State College, Jolo 7400, Philippines

*Corresponding author: gs@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. The global shift toward student-centered learning mandates that educators transition from traditional transmitters of knowledge to active pedagogical facilitators. However, evaluating the functional execution of this mandate remains underexplored within resource-constrained rural educational contexts. This study assessed the extent to which public elementary school educators perform facilitative roles across core instructional domains to implement learner-centered approaches. Employing a quantitative descriptive-correlational design, data were gathered from 100 teachers in the Indanan South District, Philippines, using a validated structured questionnaire. Statistical analyses included weighted means, independent samples t-tests, Analysis of Variance, and Pearson's correlation coefficient. Results indicated high overall proficiency in student-centered facilitation, with classroom management and instructional planning emerging as the most robustly implemented practices. Correlational analysis revealed a nearly perfect positive relationship between these two domains, indicating that structured classroom environments are direct byproducts of proactive lesson architecture. While demographic variables generally did not influence facilitative practices, a significant disparity emerged in technology integration, where intermediate-level educators reported higher utilization than primary-level teachers. Furthermore, technology use exhibited the weakest inter-domain correlations, functioning primarily as a peripheral supplement rather than a core instructional mediator. The findings affirm strong foundational competence in constructivist facilitation among rural educators but expose a critical integration gap regarding digital pedagogy. Institutional leaders and teacher education programs must prioritize advanced, grade-specific technological training to elevate digital tools into transformative mechanisms for collaborative learning.

KEYWORDS: *Student-centered Learning, Facilitative Teaching, Digital Pedagogy, Classroom Management, Constructivism, Rural Education*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00074; Received: February 16, 2026; Accepted: March 5, 2026; Published: March 18, 2026

CITATION:

Ajibun, Shernalyn A., Lim, Mary Ann G. (2026). Teachers As Facilitators: Their Role In Implementing Student-Centered Teaching Approaches In Indanan South District. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*, 3(1). DOI: 10.62596/rm4jyt44

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Journal of Education and Academic Settings* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

Introduction

The global educational paradigm has decisively shifted from traditional, teacher-centric models toward student-centered learning environments. In this framework, educators function as facilitators who design interactive and inquiry-based experiences to foster critical thinking, collaboration, and learner autonomy (Murillo & Hidalgo, 2021; Lombardi et al., 2020). This pedagogical transition is recognized internationally as a transformative approach that deepens

comprehension, strengthens higher-order cognitive skills, and aligns with broader educational priorities, such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 for inclusive and equitable education (Cattaneo & Boldrini, 2019; Lee & Martin, 2020; United Nations, 2022; UNESCO, 2023).

In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) operationalizes this shift through the K–12 Curriculum and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), mandating that educators cultivate engaging learning environments catering to diverse learners (DepEd, 2019, 2020; SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2021). However, the enactment of these pedagogical frameworks is heavily influenced by localized socio-economic realities. In rural and socio-economically challenged areas, such as the Indanan South District, educators navigate distinct constraints, including limited instructional resources, varied student proficiencies, and fluctuating classroom engagement (Regacho & Sarmiento, 2021; De Guzman & Ordon, 2020).

While national policies consistently advocate for student-centered pedagogies, there remains a critical need to understand how teachers functionally translate these mandates into practice within resource-constrained environments. Fulfilling the role of a facilitator requires not only pedagogical mastery but also continuous professional development and robust institutional support (Blayone & Mykhailenko, 2021; Weimer, 2021). Yet, there is limited empirical evaluation regarding the actual extent to which teachers in rural districts implement specific student-centered strategies and the contextual factors influencing their facilitation practices.

Therefore, this study aims to assess the role of teachers as facilitators in implementing student-centered teaching approaches within the Indanan South District. Specifically, it examines teachers' perceived facilitation roles across five core domains: instructional planning, classroom management, learning assessment, learning engagement, and the use of technology in teaching.

By identifying the extent of implementation and contextual realities, the findings of this research are expected to inform targeted improvements in instructional practices, guide localized professional development programs, and support policy initiatives aimed at sustaining learner-centered education in comparable socio-economic contexts.

Research Questions

1. What is the demographic profile of the teachers in Indanan South District in terms of:
 - 1.1. Age;
 - 1.2. Gender;
 - 1.3. Educational Attainment;
 - 1.4. Length of Service; and
 - 1.5. Grade Level Currently Teaching?
2. To what extent do teachers perceive their role as facilitators in implementing student-centered teaching approaches in the context of:
 - 2.1. Instructional Planning;
 - 2.2. Classroom Management;
 - 2.3. Learning Assessment;
 - 2.4. Learning Engagement; and
 - 2.5. Use of Technology in Teaching?
3. Is there a significant difference in the extent of the role in implementation of student-centered teaching approaches when grouped according to teachers' demographic profile of the Teacher-respondents in terms of:
 - 3.1. Age ;

- 3.2. Gender ;
 - 3.3. Educational Attainment;
 - 3.4. Length of Service; and
 - 3.5. Grade Level Currently Teaching?
4. Is there a significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under the role of teachers in the implementation of student-centered teaching approaches?

Literature

Pedagogical Shift to Facilitation.

Rooted in constructivist and socio-cultural paradigms, modern educational frameworks emphasize the active construction of knowledge over passive reception (Bruner, 1966; Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978). Within this schema, the educator's function transitions fundamentally from a primary transmitter of information to an architect of discovery and collaborative inquiry. This facilitative model requires scaffolding learning experiences within the student's zone of proximal development, gradually ceding instructional control to foster learner independence (Vygotsky, 1978). Complementing cognitive development, experiential and motivational paradigms highlight that satisfying psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness intrinsically drives student engagement and contextual application (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Kolb, 1984).

The consensus across international and Philippine educational policies firmly mirrors this theoretical shift. Global education reforms consistently position facilitative teaching as essential for cultivating 21st-century competencies, such as critical inquiry, creative exploration, and complex problem-solving (Blumberg, 2009; Brooks & Brooks, 1999; Froyd & Simpson, 2010; Weimer, 2013). Locally, institutional frameworks including the K to 12 Curriculum and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers explicitly codify this mandate. These policies require educators to transcend traditional lectures by designing adaptive, learner-centered environments that stimulate active participation and cater to diverse learning profiles (CHED, 2017; Corpuz & Salandanan, 2015; DepEd, 2013; Salandanan, 2012).

Empirical Outcomes of Facilitative Pedagogy

Empirical evidence consistently demonstrates the efficacy of facilitative teaching in enhancing cognitive and affective student outcomes. Transitioning from direct instruction to guided inquiry yields increased academic performance, heightened intrinsic motivation, and deeper conceptual retention (Bacsal, 2019; Cornelius-White, 2007; De Vera, 2018; Laguador, 2014; Nouri, 2016; Pascual & Navarrete, 2017). This pedagogical alignment actively cultivates critical thinking, learner autonomy, and collaborative proficiency across diverse educational settings (Attard et al., 2010; Benson, 2013; Brooks & Brooks, 1999; Hannafin et al., 1997; Johnson et al., 2014; O'Neill & McMahan, 2015; Prince, 2004).

Systemic Barriers and the Implementation Gap

Despite robust theoretical support and documented academic benefits, the practical execution of student-centered facilitation reveals significant systemic inconsistencies. A distinct tension exists between pedagogical awareness and actual classroom practice. While educators generally recognize the value of facilitative teaching, effective implementation is frequently constrained by structural barriers such as large class sizes, inadequate instructional materials, and limited professional training (Cabrera, 2022; Garcia, 2020; Tadesse et al., 2018). Absent robust institutional support networks, many teachers default to traditional, teacher-dominated methodologies (Cabrera, 2022).

These systemic challenges underscore a pronounced implementation gap, particularly within rural and socio-economically disadvantaged contexts. Existing literature predominantly highlights broad systemic barriers or overarching benefits, leaving a distinct empirical void regarding the granular, domain-specific application of facilitative strategies—specifically concerning instructional planning, learning assessment, and technology integration—in localized settings like the Indanan South District. Addressing this underexplored dimension is critical for evaluating the practical fidelity of ongoing educational reforms and determining the precise institutional support required to operationalize learner-centered pedagogy in comparable environments.

Methodology

1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. This methodological approach was selected to objectively quantify existing teaching conditions and determine the statistical relationships between the teachers' demographic profiles, their perceived facilitative roles, and their actual implementation of student-centered teaching strategies.

2. Participants and Sampling

The sample consisted of 100 public elementary school teachers drawn from 10 selected schools within the Indanan South District, Schools Division of Sulu. Respondents were selected using a purposive sampling technique. To ensure reliable and credible data regarding pedagogical practices, the inclusion criteria strictly required participants to be actively teaching during the 2025–2026 school year and to possess at least one year of classroom teaching experience. The study strictly adhered to ethical standards; all participants provided informed consent, participation was entirely voluntary, and data confidentiality and anonymity were maintained throughout the research process.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by School

Indanan South District School	Number Of Respondents
1. Kasambuhan Village Elementary School	10
2. Panglima Mammah Elementary School	20
3. Timbangan Elementary School	14
4. Panglima Indanan Central School	10
5. Pasil Elementary School	17
6. Poblacion Elementary School	10
7. Bunot Elementary School	7
8. Panglima Misuari Elementary School	8
9. Langpas Elementary School	4
Total :	100

3. Instruments

Data were collected using a structured, two-part questionnaire adapted from standardized tools developed by Weimer (2013), King (1993), and related pedagogical studies to ensure alignment with the research objectives. Part I captured the respondents' demographic profiles, while Part II measured the extent of their facilitative roles using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". To establish instrument validity, the questionnaire was subjected to a rigorous content evaluation by two academic experts specializing in education and research, who verified the clarity, consistency, and contextual suitability of the items.

4. Data Collection Procedure

Following the securement of informed consent, the researcher personally administered the validated survey instruments to the teacher-respondents to ensure full participation and address any immediate clarifications. Participants were allotted adequate time to complete the surveys independently. Upon completion, the researcher collected the questionnaires and systematically screened them for completeness and accuracy prior to data encoding.

5. Data Analysis

Data gathered were processed utilizing specific descriptive and inferential statistical tools to systematically address the formulated research objectives. Frequency and percentage distributions summarized the respondents' demographic characteristics, establishing the sample's profile. To quantify the perceived extent of the teachers' facilitative roles, weighted means were computed across all scaled indicators. Inferential analyses were subsequently conducted to test for significant group differences; an independent samples t-test evaluated variations based on gender and grade level taught, whereas a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) assessed differences across age, length of service, and educational attainment. Finally, a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson's *r*) was employed to establish the degree of relationship among the sub-categories defining the teachers' implementation of student-centered approaches.

Results

1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Analysis of the sample's demographic profile (N = 100) reveals a predominantly female teaching workforce (88%), with a slight majority currently assigned to intermediate grade levels (Grades 4–6; 55%). The age distribution is primarily concentrated within the middle-adulthood range, as the 30–39 and 40–49 age brackets each constitute 33% of the respondents. Regarding professional tenure, the largest segment of the population consists of early-career educators possessing five years or less of teaching experience (38%), followed by highly tenured teachers with 16 or more years of service (25%). Furthermore, an examination of educational qualifications indicates that while nearly three-quarters of the sample strictly hold a bachelor's degree (73%), a subset has pursued advanced education, with 14% having successfully completed a master's degree.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Variable	Number of Respondents (n=100)	Percentage (%)
Age		
29 years old and below	18	18%
30-39 years old	33	33%
40-49 years old	33	33%
50 years old and above	16	16%
Gender		
Male	12	12%
Female	88	88%
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	73	73%
Bachelor's Degree with Master's Units	12	12%
Master's Degree	14	14%
Master's Degree with Doctorate Units	1	1%
Doctorate Degree	0	0%
Length of Service		
5 years and below	38	38%

6-10 years	20	20%
11-15 years	17	17%
16 years and above	25	25%
Grade Level Currently Teaching		
Primary (Grade 1-3)	45	45%
Intermediate (Grade 4-6)	55	55%

2. Extent of Teachers' Role as Facilitators in Student-Centered Approaches

Overall, the respondents demonstrated a high self-reported proficiency in facilitating student-centered approaches across the five evaluated pedagogical domains. As detailed in Table 3, Classroom Management emerged as the most robustly implemented area, securing a "Strongly Agree" composite rating ($M = 4.512$, $SD = .75602$). Within this specific domain, the provision of clear instructions for classroom activities was the highest-rated individual indicator ($M = 4.64$, $SD = .77225$).

Instructional Planning, Learning Assessment, and Learning Engagement uniformly fell within the "Agree" descriptive category. Teachers reported strong facilitative behaviors in Instructional Planning ($M = 4.388$, $SD = .75160$), particularly emphasizing the integration of real-life situations to create meaningful learning experiences ($M = 4.60$, $SD = .82878$). Similarly, Learning Assessment practices ($M = 4.338$, $SD = .64585$) were primarily anchored by the recognition and celebration of student achievements and efforts ($M = 4.52$, $SD = .78470$). Regarding Learning Engagement ($M = 4.267$, $SD = .72670$), respondents indicated a consistent effort to actively involve all students in learning activities ($M = 4.49$, $SD = .68895$).

Conversely, the Use of Technology in Teaching recorded the lowest composite score ($M = 3.761$, $SD = .64868$) among the domains, though it maintained an overall "Agree" interpretation. Within this construct, the most prominent self-reported practice was the continuous updating of digital literacy skills to remain current with educational technologies ($M = 4.07$, $SD = .78180$).

Table 3: Extent of Teachers' Role as Facilitators in Implementing Student-Centered Teaching Approaches

Pedagogical Domain and Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
Instructional Planning	4.388	.75160	Agree
1. I involve students in setting learning goals in my classroom.	4.08	1.04137	Agree
2. My lesson plans emphasize student interests and backgrounds.	4.49	.85865	Agree
3. I use activities that allow students to explore, discover, and construct knowledge themselves.	4.54	.83388	Strongly Agree
4. I set clear learning objectives for every lesson.	4.51	.82260	Strongly Agree
5. I include opportunities for collaborative learning in my lesson plans.	4.52	.87016	Strongly Agree
6. I modify lessons to meet the needs of all students.	4.46	.91475	Agree
7. I integrate real-life situations to make learning meaningful.	4.60	.82878	Strongly Agree
8. I allocate time effectively for each activity in the lesson.	4.27	.91954	Agree
9. I set clear learning goals that encourage student autonomy and responsibility.	4.35	.85723	Agree
10. I incorporate technology and innovative tools in lesson planning to enhance student engagement.	4.06	.95155	Agree
Classroom Management	4.512	.75602	Strongly Agree
1. I organize the classroom to encourage collaboration among students.	4.58	.83097	Strongly Agree
2. I facilitate rather than dictate discussions.	4.41	.82993	Agree
3. I encourage students to take responsibility for their own learning.	4.31	.88415	Agree
4. I manage classroom behavior in a way that supports learning.	4.55	.78335	Strongly Agree

Pedagogical Domain and Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
5. I organize the classroom layout to facilitate group work and interaction.	4.39	.88643	Agree
6. I allow students to express their opinions and ideas freely.	4.63	.81222	Strongly Agree
7. I provide clear instructions for classroom activities.	4.64	.77225	Strongly Agree
8. I address conflicts among students in a fair and constructive manner.	4.48	.90431	Agree
9. I use positive reinforcement to encourage desirable student behavior and participation.	4.62	.81377	Strongly Agree
10. I promote learner autonomy by allowing students to take part in decision-making within classroom activities.	4.51	.87033	Strongly Agree
Learning Assessment	4.338	.64585	Agree
1. I use formative assessment (feedback, peer review) to guide learning.	4.50	.83485	Strongly Agree
2. I give students opportunities to assess themselves.	4.29	.94596	Agree
3. I adapt assessment methods based on what students can do / need.	4.29	.72884	Agree
4. I adjust my teaching strategies based on assessment results.	4.51	.74529	Strongly Agree
5. I provide opportunities for students to reflect on their learning.	4.16	.87294	Agree
6. I recognize and celebrate students' achievements and efforts.	4.52	.78470	Strongly Agree
7. I use a variety of assessment methods to evaluate learning.	4.37	.86053	Agree
8. I communicate assessment criteria clearly to students.	4.22	.85965	Agree
9. I provide timely and constructive feedback to help students improve their performance	4.39	.72328	Agree
10. I emphasize learning progress and mastery over test scores.	4.13	.77401	Agree
Learning Engagement	4.266	.56893	Agree
1. I allow students to make choices in their learning (topics, tasks, pace).	3.62	.88512	Agree
2. I encourage students to reflect on their learning process.	4.38	.80126	Agree
3. I provide opportunities for students to work on real-world or meaningful projects.	4.32	.70896	Agree
4. I use questioning techniques to stimulate higher-order thinking.	4.48	.87016	Agree
5. I support students in setting personal learning goals.	4.29	.74257	Agree
6. I provide opportunities for students to explore topics creatively.	4.37	.73382	Agree
7. I adapt activities to cater to students with different learning abilities.	4.15	.84537	Agree
8. I actively involve all students in learning activities.	4.49	.68895	Agree
9. I create an inclusive environment where every student feels valued and capable of succeeding.	4.34	.69949	Agree
10. I encourage students to set personal learning goals and monitor their own progress.	4.22	.64479	Agree
Use of Technology in Teaching	3.761	.64868	Agree
1. I integrate digital tools (e.g., PowerPoint, videos, online simulations) to enhance classroom instruction.	3.83	.99549	Agree
2. I use online platforms (e.g., Google Classroom, Microsoft Teams) to communicate and share learning materials with students.	3.59	1.06453	Agree
3. I encourage students to use technology for research and project-based learning activities.	3.91	.88871	Agree
4. I design lessons that incorporate interactive technologies to promote student engagement.	3.99	.88186	Agree
5. I use digital assessment tools (e.g., online quizzes, e-portfolios) to evaluate student learning.	3.36	.90476	Moderately Agree
6. I am confident in using technology to support various student-centered teaching strategies.	4.01	.77192	Agree

Pedagogical Domain and Indicators	Mean	Standard Deviation (S.D.)	Descriptive Interpretation
7. I integrate multimedia resources to accommodate diverse learning styles.	4.01	.83479	Agree
8. I encourage collaborative online learning through group chats, discussion boards, or shared documents.	3.33	.89955	Moderately Agree
9. I provide students with opportunities to demonstrate learning through digital outputs (e.g., videos, blogs, digital posters).	3.51	1.01995	Agree
10. I update my digital literacy skills to stay current with educational technologies.	4.07	.78180	Agree

3. Differences in Facilitative Roles Based on Demographic Profiles

To determine whether the extent of the teachers' facilitative roles varied across demographic groupings, independent samples t-tests and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted. The analyses revealed no statistically significant differences in the implementation of student-centered approaches across any of the five pedagogical domains when respondents were grouped by age, gender, educational attainment, or length of service ($p > 0.05$ for all respective comparisons).

However, when categorized by the grade level currently taught, a statistically significant difference emerged specifically within the Use of Technology in Teaching domain. As detailed in Table 4, intermediate educators reported a significantly higher extent of technology utilization ($M = 3.910$, $SD = .52939$) compared to primary educators ($M = 3.577$, $SD = .73512$), yielding a significant t-value of -2.630 ($p = .010$). No significant disparities between primary and intermediate teachers were observed across the remaining four domains, including Instructional Planning ($p = .566$) and Classroom Management ($p = .554$).

Table 4: Differences in the Extent of the Role in the Implementation of Student-Centered Teaching Approaches

Demographic Grouping	Pedagogical Domain	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
Age (ANOVA)				
	Instructional Planning	F = .602	.616	Not Significant
	Classroom Management	F = .620	.604	Not Significant
	Learning Assessment	F = 1.817	.149	Not Significant
	Learning Engagement	F = 2.139	.100	Not Significant

Demographic Grouping	Pedagogical Domain	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
	Use of Technology in Teaching	F = 1.773	.158	Not Significant
Gender (t-test)				
	Instructional Planning	t = -.390	.698	Not Significant
	Classroom Management	t = -.261	.795	Not Significant
	Learning Assessment	t = -.121	.904	Not Significant
	Learning Engagement	t = -.427	.671	Not Significant
	Use of Technology in Teaching	t = .268	.789	Not Significant
Educational Attainment (ANOVA)				
	Instructional Planning	F = 1.326	.270	Not Significant
	Classroom Management	F = .983	.404	Not Significant
	Learning Assessment	F = 2.158	.098	Not Significant
	Learning Engagement	F = 1.829	.147	Not Significant

Demographic Grouping	Pedagogical Domain	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
	Use of Technology in Teaching	F = 3.129	.129	Not Significant
Length of Service (ANOVA)				
	Instructional Planning	F = .380	.768	Not Significant
	Classroom Management	F = .783	.506	Not Significant
	Learning Assessment	F = 2.151	.099	Not Significant
	Learning Engagement	F = 1.740	.164	Not Significant
	Use of Technology in Teaching	F = .615	.607	Not Significant
Grade Level Currently Teaching (t-test)				
	Instructional Planning	t = -.576	.566	Not Significant
	Classroom Management	t = -.594	.554	Not Significant
	Learning Assessment	t = -.127	.899	Not Significant
	Learning Engagement	t = -1.086	.280	Not Significant

Demographic Grouping	Pedagogical Domain	Test Statistic (t / F)	p-value (Sig.)	Description
	Use of Technology in Teaching	t = -2.630	.010	Significant

**Significance at alpha 0.05*

4. Correlational Analysis Among Pedagogical Domains

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (Pearson's r) was utilized to examine the interrelationships among the five domains of the student-centered teaching approaches. As illustrated in Table 5, all sub-categories exhibited statistically significant positive correlations ($p = .000$). The most robust statistical relationship was observed between Instructional Planning and Classroom Management, demonstrating a nearly perfect positive correlation ($r = .941$). Very high positive correlations were identically identified among several core pedagogical practices, most notably between Classroom Management and Learning Assessment ($r = .843$), Learning Assessment and Learning Engagement ($r = .835$), and Instructional Planning and Learning Assessment ($r = .800$). Conversely, while the Use of Technology in Teaching correlated significantly with all other variables, these specific relationships were comparatively the weakest. Its highest association was a moderate correlation with Instructional Planning ($r = .475$), and its weakest was a low positive correlation with Learning Assessment ($r = .287$).

Table 5. Correlations Among the Pedagogical Domains

Variables	Pearson r	Sig.	N	Description
Instructional Planning				
Classroom Management	.941**	.000	100	Nearly Perfect Correlation
Learning Assessment	.800**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Learning Engagement	.679**	.000	100	High Correlation
Use of Technology in Teaching	.475**	.000	100	Moderate Correlation
Classroom Management				
Learning Assessment	.843**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Learning Engagement	.648**	.000	100	High Correlation
Use of Technology in Teaching	.407**	.000	100	Moderate Correlation
Learning Assessment				
Learning Engagement	.835**	.000	100	Very High Correlation
Use of Technology in Teaching	.378**	.000	100	Moderate Correlation
Learning Engagement				

Use of Technology in Teaching	.287**	.000	100	Low Correlation
-------------------------------	--------	------	-----	-----------------

** Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .01 level

Discussion

The assessment of teachers within the Indanan South District reveals a high degree of self-reported proficiency in executing student-centered teaching approaches, with educators demonstrating exceptional capability in classroom management and instructional planning. Despite a demographic profile characterized by a significant proportion of early-career teachers holding foundational bachelor's degrees, the workforce exhibits a robust systemic orientation toward active learning principles. The pronounced emphasis on classroom management suggests that these educators prioritize the establishment of structured, supportive environments characterized by clear instructions and positive reinforcement, which serve as prerequisites for active student participation.

This behavioral and structural focus aligns seamlessly with the Self-Determination Theory, which posits that well-managed, student-centered spaces satisfy essential psychological needs for learner autonomy and competence, thereby acting as critical precursors to intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Furthermore, the deliberate coupling of proactive instructional planning with classroom management reflects the core tenets of constructivist epistemology; within this framework, the educator does not merely transmit content but meticulously architects learning environments that facilitate cognitive discovery (Bruner, 1966; Piaget, 1970). These district-level observations corroborate broader local empirical evidence indicating that Philippine public school teachers who adopt facilitative roles consistently demonstrate superior classroom management and successfully cultivate higher levels of student cooperation and engagement (Pascual & Navarrete, 2017). Consequently, the established proficiency in planning and management provides educational administrators with a vital strategic advantage. Institutional support and localized professional development can pivot away from foundational classroom control toward more sophisticated, higher-order facilitation techniques, ensuring the pedagogical aspirations of the national curriculum are sustained even within resource-constrained rural districts.

Building upon these foundational management skills, the educators demonstrated a commendable capacity to adapt learning assessments and sustain student engagement. Rather than relying solely on summative metrics, teachers in this district actively employ assessment as a diagnostic compass to recognize achievements and tailor subsequent instruction to diverse learner needs. This responsive engagement ensures that students remain actively involved in higher-order cognitive tasks and collaborative activities. This adaptive approach strongly resonates with Vygotsky's (1978) Social Constructivist Theory, wherein assessment functions as a continuous tool for scaffolding, ensuring that tasks are appropriately calibrated to maintain high engagement without inducing frustration. Furthermore, these localized practices confirm prior research indicating that continuous adaptation based on individual student needs enhances overall teaching effectiveness and learner involvement (Aliazas et al., 2024; Villamero & Kamenopoulou, 2018).

Conversely, while traditional pedagogical domains thrived, the integration of educational technology emerged as the least developed facet of the teachers' facilitative repertoire, exposing a critical area of divergence based on teaching assignments. Specifically, while demographic variables such as age, gender, and length of service yielded no significant influence on facilitative practices, intermediate-level educators reported a significantly higher utilization of digital tools compared to their primary-level counterparts. This disparity likely stems from the inherent

cognitive demands of intermediate curricula, which more readily accommodate independent digital research and multimedia integration, whereas primary education traditionally necessitates more tactile, direct foundational instruction.

Despite a general commitment among educators to update their digital literacy, the data suggest that technology remains primarily a supplementary aid rather than a transformative pedagogical instrument in these classrooms. This highlights a persistent systemic hurdle previously identified in similar regional educational settings, where bridging the technological skills gap remains a critical challenge for realizing fully modernized, 21st-century instruction (Amdad & Asiri, 2024). Consequently, professional development initiatives must transcend basic ICT literacy. Institutional leaders should prioritize targeted, grade-specific technological training, empowering both primary and intermediate teachers to integrate digital tools that fundamentally elevate, rather than merely substitute, traditional student-centered learning methodologies.

Synthesizing these isolated competencies into a holistic framework, the correlational analysis underscores a highly interdependent relationship among the core pedagogical domains, most notably between proactive lesson design and structural classroom control. The nearly perfect positive association between instructional planning and classroom management strongly implies that positive behavioral manifestations and sustained student participation are direct structural byproducts of meticulous lesson architecture. When educators deliberately sequence collaborative and exploratory activities, the necessity for reactive disciplinary measures diminishes, naturally yielding a well-managed, learning-conducive environment.

This profound interconnectedness firmly anchors the empirical data within established cognitive frameworks, specifically confirming the tenets of Constructivist Theory (Bruner, 1966; Piaget, 1970). The results validate the theoretical premise that a modern educator's primary role is to meticulously architect environments conducive to cognitive discovery rather than passively delivering content. Furthermore, the robust statistical linkages connecting learning assessment with both management and planning extend Vygotsky's (1978) Social Constructivist framework. The data illustrate that continuous, diagnostic assessment functions as an essential mechanism for effective scaffolding, ensuring that learning tasks are properly calibrated to maintain optimal engagement without inducing cognitive overload.

Conversely, the notably weaker correlations bridging the use of technology with these fundamental pedagogical tools highlight a critical theoretical integration gap. While digital tools are actively utilized, they have not yet seamlessly merged with core instructional strategies; rather, they currently function as supplementary additions or superficial substitutions rather than transformative pedagogical mediators. Ultimately, these findings indicate that while the district exhibits a robust and theoretically sound foundation in traditional student-centered facilitation, educational policymakers and teacher education institutions must pivot toward targeted digital-pedagogy integration programs. By elevating technological proficiency from a peripheral skill to a core instrument of pedagogical efficacy, institutions can fully realize the transformative potential of 21st-century learner-centered environments.

Conclusion

The convergence of empirical data indicates that educators within the Indanan South District operate with a high degree of proficiency in foundational student-centered facilitation, particularly excelling in classroom management and instructional planning. By meticulously architecting learning environments and utilizing assessment as a dynamic scaffolding tool, these teachers successfully operationalize core constructivist principles to foster learner autonomy and

engagement. However, a distinct pedagogical divergence exists regarding the integration of educational technology; despite high overall facilitative competence, digital tools currently function as peripheral supplements rather than transformative instructional mediators, a gap most pronounced among primary-level educators.

These insights reinforce the necessity of evolving professional development paradigms beyond traditional classroom mechanics. Institutional leaders and the Department of Education must prioritize the institutionalization of targeted digital-pedagogy integration programs, moving beyond basic ICT literacy to equip teachers with the skills to utilize technology as an active catalyst for collaborative learning. Furthermore, Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) are distinctly positioned to address this gap by redesigning pre-service curricula to seamlessly embed technology within practicum experiences, while current practitioners should be incentivized to pursue micro-credentialing in advanced educational technology and learner-centered assessment.

While the findings offer valuable insight into modern facilitative teaching behaviors, the scope of this research was inherently constrained by its contextual localization to a single school district and its reliance on the self-reported perceptual data of educators. Consequently, the statistical models capture the intended pedagogical climate but exclude the reciprocal perspectives of students and school administrators.

To advance this growing understanding of localized pedagogical shifts, future inquiries should employ rigorous experimental designs to evaluate the direct impact of specific digital interventions—such as AI-driven assessment tools—on verifiable student engagement and academic performance within similar socio-economically challenged regions. Expanding subsequent methodological frameworks to include direct, prolonged classroom observations would also provide a more granular, triangulated assessment of how facilitative pedagogy and digital mediation are enacted in real-time.

References

- Aliazas, J. V., Pasia, A., & Madrideo, J. (2024). Teaching effectiveness: A design feedback process of one state university in the Philippines. *TWIST*, 19(3), 824–834. <https://twistjournal.net/twist/article/view/495>
- Amdad, A. K., & Asiri, M. S. (2024). Examining 21st-century teaching competencies: A study of public elementary school teachers in Patikul West District, Ministry of Basic, Higher and Technical Education-Sulu. *Journal of Education and Academic Settings*. <https://doi.org/10.62596/h1aqnm61>
- Attard, A., Di Iorio, E., Geven, K., & Santa, R. (2010). Student-centered learning: An insight into theory and practice. European Students' Union.
- Bacsal, J. (2019). Student-centered teaching practices and their effects on learner engagement in Philippine public schools.
- Benson, P. (2013). Learner autonomy in the classroom.
- Blayone, T. J. B., & Mykhailenko, O. (2021). Continuous professional development and institutional support in learner-centered pedagogy.
- Blumberg, P. (2009). *Developing learner-centered teaching: A practical guide for faculty*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1999). In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).
- Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Harvard University Press.
- Cabrera, M. (2022). Teachers' perception and practice of student-centered teaching in Sulu Province.
- Cattaneo, A., & Boldrini, E. (2019). The teacher's role as a facilitator in learner-centered environments. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 80, 97–105.
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2017). *Philippine professional standards for teachers (PPST)*.
- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 113–143.
- Corpuz, B. B., & Salandanan, G. G. (2015). *Principles of teaching 1*. Lorimar Publishing.
- De Guzman, R., & Ordon, M. (2020). Navigating limited resources and classroom engagement in rural areas.
- De Vera, J. L. (2018). Teachers' roles in implementing constructivist approaches in basic education.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum Press.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2013). *The K to 12 basic education program*.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2019). *Philippine professional standards for teachers*.
- Department of Education (DepEd). (2020). *Guidelines on learner-centered instruction*.
- Froyd, J. E., & Simpson, N. T. (2010). Student-centered learning addressing faculty questions about student-centered learning. Course, Curriculum, Labor, and Improvement Conference, Washington DC.
- Garcia, M. (2020). Implementation of learner-centered pedagogy in Mindanao public schools.
- Hannafin, M. J., Hill, J. R., & Land, S. M. (1997). Student-centered learning and interactive multimedia: Status, issues, and implication. *Contemporary Education*, 68(2), 94–99.

- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2014). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25(3&4), 85–118.
- King, A. (1993). From sage on the stage to guide on the side. *College Teaching*, 41(1), 30–35.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice-Hall.
- Laguador, J. M. (2014). Cooperative learning approach in an outcomes-based environment: A practice towards quality education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 3(2), 46–55.
- Lee, J., & Martin, L. (2020). Student-centered learning: Enhancing motivation and engagement.
- Lombardi, D., Shipley, T. F., & Team, A. (2020). Active engagement and inquiry-based learning.
- Murillo, F. J., & Hidalgo, N. (2021). Flexible, student-centered facilitation in modern classrooms.
- Nouri, J. (2016). The flipped classroom: For active, effective and increased learning – especially for low achievers. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 13(33).
- O’Neill, G., & McMahon, T. (2015). Student-centered learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers? AISHE.
- Pascual, L., & Navarrete, M. (2017). Teachers’ facilitation skills and learners’ academic performance in student-centered classrooms.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Science of education and the psychology of the child*. Orion Press.
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231.
- Regacho, A., & Sarmiento, P. (2021). Diverse student abilities in socio-economically challenged areas.
- Salandan, G. G. (2012). *Teaching and the teacher*. Lorimar Publishing.
- SEAMEO INNOTECH. (2021). *Cultivating supportive and engaging learning environments*.
- Tadesse, T., Manathunga, C., & Gillies, R. M. (2018). The implementation of student-centered learning in higher education. *Higher Education*, 75(4).
- UNESCO. (2023). *Inclusive, equitable, and high-quality education for all*.
- United Nations. (2022). *Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education*.
- Villamero, R. J. C., & Kamenopoulou, L. (2018). Teachers’ assessment strategies for children with disabilities: A constructivist study in mainstream primary schools in Negros Oriental, Philippines. In L. Kamenopoulou (Ed.), *Inclusive education and disability in the global south* (pp. 73–95). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72829-2_4
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Weimer, M. (2013). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Weimer, M. (2021). *Continuous professional development in learner-centered teaching*.