Implementation and Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Student-Centered Learning Approach in Zone II, Division of Zambales

Aljun M. Domacena[1], Irene M. Ebal, Ed.D[2]

[1]President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba, Zambales

[2]Department of Education Schools Division of Zambales, Philippines

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000830

Received: 29 October 2026; Accepted: 03 November 2026; Published: 20 November 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the implementation of student-centered learning among Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II, Division of Zambales, addressing the intersection of teacher profiles, practices, and contextual challenges. While teachers consistently applied student-centered approaches, systemic constraints such as limited instructional resources, large class sizes, and learner readiness issues persisted. Variations were observed only in relation to position and educational attainment, underscoring that challenges are structural rather than individual. Guided by these findings, the study developed a comprehensive enhancement program titled "Empowering Araling Panlipunan Teachers: A Responsive Program to Overcome Challenges in Student-Centered Learning." The program integrates inquiry-based instruction, collaborative resource development, differentiated strategies, classroom management training, learner readiness support, and continuous monitoring. It is designed to strengthen teacher competence, improve resource accessibility, and promote sustainable student-centered practices, serving as the final output of the study.

The study recommends sustained professional development, resource strengthening, and policy-aligned instructional support to optimize implementation. Future research may broaden the scope to validate and refine these results across wider educational contexts.

Keywords: challenges encountered, implementation, student-centered learning approach

BACKGROUND

Student-centered approach in teaching and learning or student-centered instruction is now widely used in the educational sector to indicate a major shift away from teacher-centered education. Conventional teacher-centered education typically focuses on transmitting knowledge and providing information to meet curriculum standards, and teaching materials are frequently syllabus-directed. There are typically little attempts to engage in meaningful conversations with students and the flow of information is unidirectional. Teachers provide the knowledge and students contribute very little to its development (Tang, 2023).

This is especially true in many parts of the world where reticence remains common as a sign of respect for teachers. There are also several modes of knowledge transmission that fall between the two extremes, represented by going beyond syllabus and delivering more cohesive material to students before assisting them in learning, and then applying and synthesizing knowledge (Murphy, Eduljee & Croteau, 2021). Without intervention and supervision to ensure that discussions and self-learning activities keep on track, the classroom may become noisy and disorganized. Furthermore, a student-centered classroom may function differently for students of varying levels (Nuñez & Oliver, 2021). According to Khoury (2022), Study found students and teachers to perceive student-centered approach positively but there were challenges in teamwork and time management and teachers felt the effectiveness of such approach depended on students' maturity.

On the other hand, Some people find Social Studies lectures dull and uninteresting, with the teacher giving a lecture and the students taking notes. That need not be the case, for sure. The dull atmosphere of an educator-centered social studies classroom may be swiftly replaced with a student-centered one that becomes a hive of activity. Highlighting the gap that there are several challenges when a Social Studies classroom is changed from one that is passive to one that is lively and captivating. It is crucial that Social Studies teachers create a student-centered classroom that fosters critical thinking skills and present their craft to their students in this way (Searles, 2023).

A research on the implementation and challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in a student-centered approach. The learning technique was required for a variety of reasons with bigger educational aims and contributing to overall enhancements in teaching and learning experiences. This gap highlights the need for this research, which emphasizes the student-centered learning approach.

The purpose of this study was to determine the Implementation and Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Student-Centered Learning Approach in Zone II, Division of Zambales.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the Implementation and Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Student-Centered Learning Approach in Zone II, Division of Zambales.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

What is the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers in terms of:

1.1 Age;

1.2 Sex;

1.3 Highest Educational Attainment;

1.4 Years in Service as Public School Teacher; and

1.5 Position?

How are student-centered learning approaches frequently implemented by Araling Panlipunan teachers in terms of:

2.1 Classroom activities;

2.2 Assessment practices; and

2.3 Learner engagement?

How are the challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered learning approaches manifested in terms of:

3.1 Instructional Resources;

3.2 Teacher competence and training;

3.3 Time management;

3.4 Class size; and

3.5 Learner-related factors?

- Is there a significant difference on the implementation of student-centered learning approaches when grouped according to profile variables?
- Is there a significant difference on the challenges encountered of student-centered learning approaches when grouped according to profile variables?
- Is there a significant relationship between the implementation and challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers?
- What program can be develop to enhance the implementation and minimize the challenge met by teacher?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the implementation and challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in the student-centered learning approach in Zone II, Division of Zambales. Specifically, it employed descriptive-correlational statistics to describe the variables and examine the relationships among them. As explained by Bhat (2023), descriptive-correlational research aimed to examine and describe the relationship between two or more variables without implying cause-and-effect relationships.

In this study, the descriptive-correlational quantitative approach focused on the respondents' profile in terms of age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as a public school teacher, and position. It also focused on the implementation of student-centered learning approaches by Araling Panlipunan teachers in terms of classroom activities, assessment practices, and learner engagement. Furthermore, it examined the challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of instructional resources, teacher competence and training, time management, class size and classroom environment, and learner-related factors.

Also, identified a total population of one hundred six (106) Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II, Division of Zambales.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used in this study was a modified-standardized survey questionnaire designed to collect data from teacher respondents. The questionnaire was adapted from the study of Mendoza (2024) titled Extent of Implementation and Issues Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Student-Centered Learning Approach, with modifications made to suit the context and objectives of the present research.

The instrument was grounded in relevant literature and existing studies and was aligned with established frameworks for evaluating the student-centered approach in Araling Panlipunan instruction. Necessary revisions were applied to ensure its suitability to the selected respondents and the specific locale of the study.

A questionnaire was a semi-structured data collection tool used to systematically gather information, making it an essential component of the research process (Creswell, 2018). It facilitated efficient data collection across diverse populations through both traditional and digital platforms.

Prior to its administration, the modified questionnaire was undergo validation by experts and pilot testing to ensure reliability and clarity of the items.

The teacher-respondents' questionnaire, Part I Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, Years in Service as Public School Teacher and Position; Part 2 including their implementation of student-centered learning approaches by Araling Panlipunan teachers in terms of: Classroom activities, Assessment practices and Learner engagement and Part 3 the challenges are encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of: Instructional resources, Teacher competence and training, Time management, Class size and Learner-related factors.

A Likert scale rating was employed, ranging from Very Highly Implemented to Not Implemented at all and from Very Evident to Not Evident

(4 points), Highly Implemented (3 points), Slightly Implemented (2 points), and Not Implemented at all (1 point), also, Very Evident (4 points), Evident (3 points), Slightly Evident (2 points) and Not Evident (1 points). Determined the Implementation and Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Student-Centered Learning Approach.

To ensure the validity of the instrument, the researcher sought the assistance of experts and panelists in the field. After the validation, the researcher incorporated the panelists' comments and suggestions before administering the pilot test. The pilot testing was conducted with 15 randomly Araling Panlipunan Teachers from the President Ramon Magsaysay State University, Iba (PRMSU). Following this, the study employed Cronbach's alpha as the statistical measure of internal consistency. Cronbach's alpha is widely used in educational and social science research to determine how closely related the items in a scale are as a group. A coefficient value closer to 1.0 indicates stronger reliability, with values above 0.70 generally considered acceptable. In this study, the computed Cronbach's alpha confirmed that the items consistently measured the intended constructs, thereby strengthening the credibility of the findings.

Data Collection

The researcher secured a written permit or endorsement from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Department of Education (DepEd), Division of Zambales. After obtaining the approval, the researcher sought permission and assistance from the school principals and Araling Panlipunan teachers of Rofulo Landa National High School, Locloc National High School, Zambales National High School, Amungan National High School, Jesus F. Magsaysay High School (ZNHS-Annex), Botolan National High School, Panan National High School, New Taugtog National High School, Baquilan Resettlement High School, Lakas High School, Loob Bunga High School, and Beneg National High School to administered the survey questionnaire during the School Year 2026–2027.A formal request letter was sent to the Schools Division Superintendent to obtain approval to conduct the study. Likewise, permission was sought from the principals of the identified schools to facilitate the administration of the survey.

The researcher administered the questionnaires in person, utilizing face-to-face interactions during the respondents' available time, such as breaks or free periods. Copies of the survey questionnaires were produced based on the total number of respondents. After the respondents completed the questionnaires, the collected data were compiled, organized, and prepared for further statistical analysis and interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of Araling Panlipunan Teacher-respondents

The frequency and percentage distribution on the araling panlipunan teacher-respondents' profile of age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teacher, and position is shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution on the Araling Panlipunan Teacher-respondents' Profile Variables

Profile Variables		**Frequency (f)**	**Percentage (%)**
Age (Years)	Above 56	2	1.90
Mean = 37.95 or	51 - 55	4	3.80

38 years old	46 - 50	11	10.40
	41 - 45	22	20.80
	36 - 40	23	21.70
	31 - 35	27	25.50
	26 - 30	13	12.30
	21 - 25	4	3.80
	Total	**106**	**100.00**
Sex	Female	76	71.70
	Male	30	28.30
	Total	**106**	**100.00**
Highest Educational Attainment	Doctorate degree holder (PhD/EdD, etc)	4	3.80
	Master's degree with units in Doctorate	7	6.60
	Master's degree holder	26	24.50
	Bachelor's degree with units in MA	57	53.80
	Bachelor's degree	12	11.30
	Total	**106**	**100.00**

Age

Out of one hundred six (106) Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents, majority with twenty-seven (27) or 25.50% belong to age bracket of 31-35 years old. This is followed by Araling Panlipunan teachers who belong to age bracket of 36-40 years old, with twenty-three (23) responses or 21.70%; twenty-two (22) or 20.80% belong to age bracket of 41-45 years old; thirteen (13) or 12.30% belong to age bracket of 26-30 years old; eleven (11) or 10.40% belong to age bracket of 46-50 years old; four (4) or 3.80% belong to age bracket of 51-55 and 21-25 years old, respectively; while two (2) or 1.90% belong to age bracket of 56 years old and above.

The computed mean age of the Araling Panlipunan teachers was 37.95 or 38 years old. The findings imply that the teachers are middle-aged adults.

The present finding aligns with recent evidence emphasizing the significance of a mature teaching workforce in sustaining instructional quality and professional effectiveness. The study of Dela Cruz and Cabardo (2023) found that teachers in their middle career stage exhibited stronger instructional competence and greater engagement in professional responsibilities because of accumulated teaching experiences. Similarly, Alibudbud (2023) reported that educators within the middle adulthood age range demonstrated higher levels of work engagement and organizational commitment, which contributed to improved educational outcomes. Supporting these observations, Klassen and Kim (2024) noted that experienced teachers often possess enhanced self efficacy and classroom management capabilities, enabling them to navigate increasingly complex educational demands. Likewise, Collie and Martin (2023) highlighted that teachers with greater

professional maturity tend to display stronger adaptability, resilience, and instructional confidence when responding to curriculum reforms and diverse learner needs. These studies collectively reinforce the present finding by demonstrating that middle aged educators often represent a highly productive segment of the teaching profession, combining professional expertise, institutional knowledge, and adaptive capacity that support effective teaching performance and sustained educational quality.

Sex

In terms of sex, majority of the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents are female, with seventy-six (76) responses or 71.70%; while thirty (30) or 28.30% are male.

The dominance of female Araling Panlipunan teachers compared to male counterpart participated in the conduct of the present study.

Recent literature supports the observed predominance of female teachers within the educational workforce. UNESCO (2023) reported that women continue to comprise the majority of teachers across many educational systems, particularly at the basic education level, reflecting the enduring feminization of the teaching profession. Similarly, Cabugsa et al. (2023) found that teaching remains widely perceived as a profession strongly associated with women, influencing workforce composition and participation patterns. In addition, Alinea and Reyes (2023) emphasized that gender representation continues to shape educational practice and teacher preparation, with female participation remaining highly visible across instructional settings. Likewise, Yip and Ji (2024) observed that despite ongoing efforts to diversify the teaching workforce, women still constitute a substantial proportion of educators in many schools. These studies are similar to the present findings because they collectively demonstrate the continuing dominance of female educators within the teaching profession. The convergence of these findings suggests that the greater representation of women in teaching is not merely a local phenomenon but a broader trend shaped by historical participation patterns, professional preferences, and societal expectations regarding educational and nurturing roles. As observed in many schools, female teachers frequently assume responsibilities that extend beyond classroom instruction, including student mentoring, guidance activities, community engagement, and academic leadership functions, further reinforcing their significant presence and contribution within educational institutions.

Highest Educational Attainment

There are fifty-seven (57) or 53.80% of the Araling Panlipunan teachers earned units in Masters, had the highest number of responses This is followed by Araling Panlipunan teachers who are Master's degree holders, with twenty-six (26) or 24.50%; twelve (12) or 11.30% are Bachelor's degree holders; seven (7) or 6.60% are Doctorate unit earners; while four (4) or 3.80% are Doctorate degree holders.

The present finding is supported by recent studies highlighting the growing engagement of teachers in graduate education as a means of strengthening professional competence and instructional quality. Sulla, Corpuz, and Valdez (2024) found that educators who pursued advanced academic qualifications demonstrated stronger commitment to professional development and were more likely to implement innovative teaching practices. Similarly, Alibudbud, Cleofas, and De Guzman (2023) reported that continuing education contributes to enhanced professional confidence, knowledge acquisition, and career advancement among educators. In another study, Tikly, Barrett, and Bainton (2023) emphasized that higher educational qualifications equip teachers with deeper pedagogical understanding and greater capacity to respond to evolving educational demands. Likewise, Admiraal, Schenke, De Jong, Emmelot, and Sligte (2024) observed that teachers engaged in graduate level learning exhibit stronger reflective practices and greater involvement in evidence based decision making within schools. These studies are similar to the present findings because they collectively indicate that educators increasingly recognize graduate education as an essential mechanism for improving instructional competence, expanding professional knowledge, and enhancing career progression. Across educational settings, teachers who invest in advanced studies are often observed to become more proactive in leading educational initiatives, mentoring colleagues, and applying research informed practices, reinforcing

the importance of higher academic qualifications in fostering a highly capable and professionally responsive teaching workforce.

Years in Service as Public School Teacher

Majority of the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents with twenty-four (24) or 22.60% are 8-10 and 4-7 years in service as public school teachers, respectively; twenty-two (22) or 20.80% are below 3 years in service as public school teachers; twenty-one (21) or 19.80% are 11-15 years in service as public school teachers; ten (10) or 9.40% are 16-20 years in service as public school teachers; while five (5) or 4.70% are 21 years and above in service as public school teachers.

The computed years in service as public school teachers of the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents was 9.06 or 9 years. The findings signify that the respondents are highly proficient Araling Panlipunan teachers.

Table 2 Frequency and Percentage Distribution on the Araling Panlipunan

Teacher-respondents' Profile Variables (Continuation)

Profile Variables		**Frequency (f)**	**Percentage (%)**
Years in Service as Public School Teacher **Mean = 9.06 or 9 years in service**	21 years and above	5	4.70
	16 - 20	10	9.40
	11 - 15	21	19.80
	8 - 10	24	22.60
	4 - 7	24	22.60
	Below 3 years	22	20.80
	Total	**106**	**100.00**
Position	Master Teacher IV	0	0.00
	Master Teacher III	0	0.00
	Master Teacher II	1	0.90
	Master Teacher I	3	2.80
	Teacher VII	0	0.00
	Teacher VI	4	3.80
	Teacher V	0	0.00
	Teacher IV	3	2.80
	Teacher III	39	36.80
	Teacher II	27	25.50

	Teacher I	29	27.40
	Total	**106**	**100.00**

The present finding is consistent with the study of Evangelio and Escote (2024), which emphasized that teachers with longer professional engagement demonstrate stronger competence and performance across established teaching standards, reflecting the value of accumulated classroom experience in enhancing instructional effectiveness. Similarly, Basanes (2025) found that highly competent and productive teachers often draw upon years of professional practice to improve instructional delivery, classroom management, and learner engagement. Supporting these observations, Dey and Roy (2023) reported that teaching experience significantly contributes to professional commitment and social intelligence, both of which are essential attributes for effective educational practice and sustained career development. Likewise, Numeron et al. (2023) highlighted that teaching experience positively influences educational effectiveness and learner satisfaction, suggesting that prolonged service strengthens teachers' capacity to address diverse instructional challenges. These studies parallel the present findings by demonstrating that experience serves as a critical mechanism through which educators develop deeper pedagogical knowledge, refined instructional skills, and greater professional confidence. In many educational settings, teachers with extensive classroom exposure are often observed to make more informed instructional decisions, adapt more effectively to curriculum changes, and respond more efficiently to learners' varying needs, thereby reinforcing the conclusion that sustained years of service contribute substantially to high levels of teacher proficiency.

Position

The position of the majority of the Araling Panlipunan teachers is Teacher III, with thirty-nine (39) responses or 36.80%; twenty-nine (29) or 27.40% are Teacher I; twenty-seven (27) or 25.50% are Teacher II; four (4) or 3.80% are Teacher VI; three (3) or 2.80% are Master Teacher I and Teacher IV, respectively; while only one (1) or 0.90% is a Master Teacher II.

The present findings are consistent with the study of Gonzales et al. (2024), which found that teachers in mid career positions demonstrate strong instructional competence and adaptability, reflecting the impact of progressive professional advancement on classroom effectiveness. Similarly, Ramirez and Santos (2023) reported that teacher ranking is significantly associated with instructional performance, where educators in higher professional classifications tend to exhibit more refined pedagogical strategies and classroom management skills. Supporting this, Khan et al. (2025) emphasized that structured career progression systems contribute to teacher motivation and improved instructional quality, particularly among mid level professionals who actively refine their teaching practices through experience and evaluation feedback. Likewise, Nguyen and Tran (2023) observed that teacher rank and professional status are closely linked to leadership capacity and instructional effectiveness, with mid ranked teachers playing a crucial role in sustaining classroom productivity and supporting school based initiatives.

Perceived Implementation Practices of Teachers in Student-centered Learning Approach

Classroom Activities

Table 3 shows the perceived implementation practices of teachers in student-centered learning approach in terms of classroom activities.

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement Indicator 4, which pertains to allowing their students to present outputs and explain their understanding, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 3.64 (Rank 1).

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement Indicator 9, which pertains to providing tasks that require their learners to interpret data, maps, or sources, had the lowest weighted mean of 3.53 (Rank 10).

The finding aligns with recent literature emphasizing both the importance and challenges of integrating source-based and data interpretation tasks in classroom instruction. Monteiro and Wylie (2024) found that students develop stronger historical reasoning skills when regularly engaged in structured analysis of primary sources, although teachers often report difficulty in consistently implementing such tasks due to time and resource limitations. Similarly, Lee, Chen, and Huang (2023) emphasized that map and data interpretation activities significantly enhance students' spatial thinking and analytical competence, but require carefully designed scaffolding strategies for effective classroom integration. In addition, Rodriguez and Alvarez (2025) reported that while teachers recognize the value of document-based learning tasks, they tend to prioritize less cognitively demanding activities when instructional pressures increase, leading to inconsistent implementation of higher-order interpretive tasks. Furthermore, Smith and Brown (2023) highlighted that regular exposure to source analysis activities improves critical thinking and inquiry skills, but sustained teacher support and adequate instructional materials are necessary to maximize effectiveness. Collectively, these studies support the present findings by showing that although interpretive tasks are widely acknowledged as essential for developing higher-order thinking skills, their classroom implementation often ranks lower due to practical constraints and instructional demands. The implication is that strengthening teacher capacity through training, resource provision, and structured instructional guides may enhance the consistent integration of data, map, and source interpretation tasks, ultimately improving learners' analytical and historical thinking skills.

Table 3 Perceived Implementation Practices of Teachers in Student-centered

Learning Approach in terms of Classroom Activities

Classroom Activities		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I implement interactive activities such as debates, role plays, and simulations.	3.56	Very Highly Implemented	9
2	I provide group tasks that require collaboration and shared responsibility.	3.62	Very Highly Implemented	5
3	I engage learners in activities that develop analytical and reasoning skills.	3.58	Very Highly Implemented	8
4	I allow students to present outputs and explain their understanding.	3.64	Very Highly Implemented	1
5	I provide opportunities for project-based and performance tasks.	3.60	Very Highly Implemented	7
6	I encourage participation in discussion of contemporary social issues.	3.63	Very Highly Implemented	3
7	I engage learners in activities connected to community and real-life contexts.	3.63	Very Highly Implemented	3

8	I promote teamwork in completing classroom tasks and projects.	3.63	Very Highly Implemented	3
9	I provide tasks that require learners to interpret data, maps, or sources.	3.53	Very Highly Implemented	10
10	I encourage student participation in decision-making during activities.	3.61	Very Highly Implemented	6
Overall Weighted Mean		**3.60**	**Very Highly Implemented**	

Assessment Practices

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement Indicator 2, which pertains to providing assessment tasks aligned with learning competencies, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 3.70 (Rank 1).

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement Indicator 7, which pertains to incorporating self-assessment to monitor learner understanding, had the lowest weighted mean of 3.59 (Rank 10). The finding aligns with recent studies emphasizing both the importance and challenges of integrating self-assessment practices in classroom instruction. Panadero, Broadbent, and Boud (2023) found that self-assessment significantly improves student learning outcomes when systematically integrated, particularly by enhancing metacognitive regulation and learner autonomy. Similarly, Yan and Brown (2024) reported that while self-assessment is highly effective in promoting reflective learning and achievement, teachers often struggle with its consistent implementation due to lack of training and limited instructional time.

Table 4 Perceived Implementation Practices of Teachers in Student-centered

Learning Approach in terms of Assessment Practices

Assessment Practices		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I utilize performance-based assessments such as projects and presentations.	3.64	Very Highly Implemented	6
2	I provide assessment tasks aligned with learning competencies.	3.70	Very Highly Implemented	1
3	I use varied assessment tools to measure understanding and skills.	3.67	Very Highly Implemented	4
4	I provide timely and constructive feedback on student performance.	3.62	Very Highly Implemented	8
5	I encourage learners to reflect on their learning progress.	3.68	Very Highly Implemented	3
6	I provide opportunities for peer assessment during activities.	3.60	Very Highly Implemented	9

7	I incorporate self-assessment to monitor learner understanding.	3.59	Very Highly Implemented	10
8	I use rubrics to guide students in completing performance tasks.	3.69	Very Highly Implemented	2
9	I design assessment tasks that require critical thinking and application.	3.63	Very Highly Implemented	7
10	I align assessment methods with student-centered learning objectives.	3.65	Very Highly Implemented	5
Overall Weighted Mean		**3.65**	**Very Highly Implemented**	

Learner Engagement

Table 5 shows the perceived implementation practices of teachers in student-centered learning approach in terms of learner engagement.

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement Indicator 1, which pertains to encouraging active participation of learners during classroom discussions; and Indicator 3 which pertains to engaging students in meaningful discussions about lesson topics, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 3.74 (tied at Rank 1.5). The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement Indicator 5, which pertains to supporting learners autonomy in completing assigned tasks, had the lowest weighted mean of 3.67 (Rank 10).

The finding aligns with recent literature emphasizing both the importance of learner autonomy and the challenges in fully integrating it into classroom practice. Holec (2023) emphasized that learner autonomy significantly enhances academic achievement by promoting self regulated learning, although its implementation requires gradual scaffolding and teacher support. Similarly, Reinders and Balcikanli (2024) found that while autonomy supportive teaching strategies improve motivation and engagement, many teachers still rely heavily on structured guidance due to concerns about learner capability and task completion.

Table 5 Perceived Implementation Practices of Teachers in Student-centered

Learning Approach in terms of Learner Engagement

Learner Engagement		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I encourage active participation of learners during classroom discussions.	3.74	Very Highly Implemented	1.5
2	I promote a classroom environment where learners feel comfortable sharing ideas.	3.72	Very Highly Implemented	3
3	I engage students in meaningful discussions about lesson topics.	3.74	Very Highly Implemented	1.5
4	I encourage curiosity and interest in Araling Panlipunan concepts.	3.71	Very Highly Implemented	4.5
5	I support learner autonomy in completing assigned tasks.	3.67	Very Highly Implemented	10

6	I motivate learners to participate in collaborative learning activities.	3.69	Very Highly Implemented	8
7	I promote responsibility for learning through active involvement.	3.69	Very Highly Implemented	8
8	I engage learners in analyzing social, cultural, and historical issues.	3.69	Very Highly Implemented	8
9	I encourage learners to ask questions and express insights freely.	3.70	Very Highly Implemented	6
10	I maintain an inclusive classroom environment that supports participation.	3.71	Very Highly Implemented	4.5
Overall Weighted Mean		**3.71**	**Very Highly Implemented**	

Summary: Perceived Implementation Practices of Teachers in Student-centered Learning Approach

Table 6 shows the summary on the perceived implementation practices of teachers in student-centered learning approach. It can be noted that the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement student-centered learning approaches in terms of learner engagement, as manifested with the highest overall weighted mean of 3.71 (Rank 1); assessment practices, with an overall weighted mean value of 3.65 (Rank 2); and classroom activities, had the lowest overall weighted mean of 3.60 (Rank 3).

Table 6 Summary on the Perceived Implementation Practices of Teachers in Student-centered Learning Approach

Dimensions		**Overall Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	Classroom Activities	3.60	Very Highly Implemented	3
2	Assessment Practices	3.65	Very Highly Implemented	2
3	Learner Engagement	3.71	Very Highly Implemented	1
Grand Mean		**3.65**	**Very Highly Implemented**	

Overall, the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents very highly implement student-centered learning approach in Zone II Division of Zambales, manifested on the computed grand mean of 3.65. The overall findings indicate that Araling Panlipunan teachers demonstrate a consistently very high implementation of student-centered learning approaches across learner engagement, assessment practices, and classroom activities, reflecting a coherent instructional system that prioritizes active learner participation and meaningful learning experiences. This suggests that instructional planning, delivery, and evaluation are strongly aligned with learner-centered principles where students are positioned as active participants in knowledge construction rather than passive recipients of information. In actual classroom practice, this is evident through frequent use of collaborative tasks, guided discussions, performance-based outputs, and competency-aligned assessments that encourage learners to articulate understanding, apply concepts, and engage critically with content. The slightly higher emphasis on learner engagement implies that interaction and participation are the most dominant features of instruction, while assessment practices closely follow to ensure that learning outcomes are appropriately measured, and classroom activities serve as the foundational structure that supports both engagement and assessment processes. This pattern reflects a well balanced instructional approach where teachers integrate pedagogy and assessment in a way that supports both cognitive and communicative development of learners. The strong implementation further suggests that teachers have developed a high level of pedagogical competence in managing learner-centered environments despite common classroom constraints such as large class sizes, time limitations, and diverse learner needs. Overall, this indicates that student-centered learning is not an isolated practice but a sustained instructional culture that enhances learner

motivation, participation, and deeper understanding of Araling Panlipunan concepts, while also strengthening learners' critical thinking and communication skills.

The present findings are consistent with the study of Alfaro and Reyes (2023), which found that integrated student-centered instructional practices across engagement, assessment, and classroom activities significantly enhance learner achievement by promoting active participation and aligned evaluation processes. Similarly, González and López (2024) reported that classrooms characterized by high learner engagement and competency-based assessment practices demonstrate stronger academic performance and deeper conceptual understanding due to coherent instructional alignment. In addition, Gillies and Zhang (2023) emphasized that collaborative classroom activities and interactive learning environments foster higher levels of student motivation and sustained engagement, which are essential components of effective student-centered instruction. Furthermore, Wang, Liu, and Zhang (2025) highlighted that the integration of participatory learning activities with aligned assessment strategies strengthens critical thinking and knowledge retention by ensuring that learning experiences are both meaningful and measurable. Collectively, these studies align with the present findings by demonstrating that student-centered learning is most effective when engagement, assessment, and instructional activities are intentionally integrated into a unified pedagogical framework. The implication is that sustaining and further enhancing this balanced approach can improve instructional quality, strengthen learner autonomy, and promote deeper and more meaningful learning outcomes across educational contexts.

Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches

Instructional Resources

The perceived challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered approaches in terms of instructional resources is shown in Table 7.

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 1 to be evident, which pertains on the challenge of experiencing insufficient instructional materials which limit the effective implementation of student-centered learning strategies in Araling Panlipunan classes, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 2.99 (Rank 1). The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 5 to be evident, which pertains to the challenge of encountering difficulty in sourcing appropriate learning materials that support collaborative and inquiry-based activities, had the lowest weighted mean of 2.74 (Rank 10).

Recent literature supports and contextualizes this finding by emphasizing both the importance and persistent gaps in access to inquiry-based and collaborative learning materials in social studies education. Gonzales (2023) highlighted that contextualized and localized learning materials significantly enhance student engagement and inquiry skills in Araling Panlipunan, yet their availability remains limited in many public-school contexts, restricting full implementation of active learning strategies .

Table 7 Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches in terms of Instructional Resources

Instructional Resources		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I experience that insufficient instructional materials limit the effective implementation of student-centered learning strategies in Araling Panlipunan classes.	2.99	Evident	1
2	I find that the availability of updated teaching resources is inadequate to support student-centered instructional practices.	2.97	Evident	3.5

3	I experience limited access to technology-based resources, which affects the conduct of interactive learning activities.	2.87	Evident	7
4	I observe that the school lacks adequate multimedia tools necessary for facilitating student-centered learning experiences.	2.80	Evident	8
5	I encounter difficulty in sourcing appropriate learning materials that support collaborative and inquiry-based activities.	2.74	Evident	10
6	I believe that existing instructional materials are not sufficient to accommodate the diverse learning needs of students.	2.76	Evident	9
7	I experience limited access to reference materials in the library, which affects the conduct of research-oriented classroom activities.	2.88	Evident	6
8	I experience internet connectivity issues that hinder the integration of digital resources in student-centered instruction.	2.89	Evident	5
9	I often need to develop or provide my own materials to support student-centered learning activities.	2.97	Evident	3.5
10	I observe that the shortage of visual and audio learning aids affects the quality of interactive classroom instruction.	2.98	Evident	2
Overall Weighted Mean		**2.89**	**Evident**	

Teacher Competence and Training

The perceived challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered approaches in terms of teacher competence and training is shown in Table 8.

Table 8 Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches in terms of Teacher Competence and Training

Teacher Competence and Training		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I face challenges in implementing student-centered learning because I need additional training.	2.65	Evident	2
2	I find that limited professional development opportunities affect my competence in applying student-centered strategies.	2.62	Evident	3
3	I experience difficulty transitioning from traditional teaching methods to student-centered instruction.	2.58	Evident	6
4	I encounter challenges in designing activities that promote active student engagement.	2.59	Evident	4.5

5	I find that insufficient training in innovative teaching strategies affects the implementation of interactive classroom practices.	2.69	Evident	1
6	I experience difficulty facilitating collaborative learning activities effectively.	2.47	Slightly Evident	9
7	I lack confidence in managing student-centered classroom discussions.	2.36	Slightly Evident	10
8	I find that limited exposure to modern instructional techniques affects my ability to implement student-centered learning effectively.	2.59	Evident	4.5
9	I experience insufficient mentoring or support in implementing innovative teaching approaches.	2.48	Slightly Evident	8
10	I encounter challenges in assessing learning outcomes in student-centered classroom environments.	2.51	Evident	7
Overall Weighted Mean		**2.55**	**Evident**	

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 5 to be evident, which pertains on the challenge of finding insufficient training in innovative teaching strategies that affects the implementation of interactive classroom practices, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 2.69 (Rank 1).

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 7 to be slightly evident, which pertains to the challenge of lack of confidence in managing student-centered classroom discussions, had the lowest weighted mean of 2.36 (Rank 10).

Recent studies support the notion that teacher confidence in facilitating student-centered discussions is closely linked to training, experience, and instructional support. According to OECD (2023), teachers who receive continuous professional development in active learning strategies demonstrate higher self-efficacy in managing interactive classroom environments, while those with limited exposure tend to struggle with sustaining meaningful student discourse. Similarly, UNESCO (2023) emphasizes that teacher confidence in learner-centered facilitation improves when schools provide structured mentoring and collaborative teaching opportunities, which help educators refine their classroom management and questioning techniques.

Time Management

The perceived challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered approaches in terms of time management is shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches in terms of Time Management

Time Management		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I find that student-centered learning activities require more preparation time compared to traditional teaching methods.	2.82	Evident	2
2	I experience that limited class time restricts the effective implementation of interactive learning activities.	2.77	Evident	3

3	I encounter difficulty completing lesson objectives within the allotted class period when using student-centered approaches.	2.71	Evident	8
4	I find that the preparation of instructional materials for student-centered learning requires considerable time and effort.	2.84	Evident	1
5	I experience that time constraints limit the integration of collaborative and inquiry-based activities in the classroom.	2.76	Evident	4.5
6	I observe that managing group activities consumes a significant portion of instructional time.	2.76	Evident	4.5
7	I experience difficulty balancing content coverage and student participation within the given time frame.	2.70	Evident	10
8	I find that monitoring and guiding multiple student groups requires substantial instructional time.	2.75	Evident	6
9	I experience that time limitations affect the thorough facilitation of class discussions and reflective activities.	2.71	Evident	8
10	I observe that the implementation of student-centered strategies sometimes results in insufficient time for lesson closure and assessment.	2.71	Evident	8
Overall Weighted Mean		**2.75**	**Evident**	

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 4 to be evident, which pertains on the challenge of finding that the preparation of instructional materials for student-centered learning requires considerable time and effort, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 2.84 (Rank 1).

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 7 to be evident, which pertains to the challenge of experience difficulty balancing content coverage and student participation within the given time frame, had the lowest weighted mean of 2.70 (Rank 10).

Narvacan (2023) found that teachers implementing student centered instruction were generally successful in facilitating active learning despite encountering classroom challenges. The study emphasized that effective classroom management, clear instructional routines, and varied learning activities enabled teachers to maintain student participation while accomplishing lesson objectives, supporting the present finding that balancing content coverage and participation was the least challenging among the identified concerns. Similarly, Sarsale and Langub (2023) reported that student centered approaches such as inquiry based and problem based learning significantly enhanced learners' engagement, although teachers needed careful lesson planning to maximize instructional time and achieve curriculum goals. Their findings reinforce the present study by demonstrating that appropriate instructional strategies can successfully integrate student participation without substantially compromising content delivery. In another Philippine study, Obenza-Tanudtanud and Obenza (2023) highlighted that effective teacher student interaction contributes positively to learner engagement and classroom participation, although teachers continue to experience instructional challenges related to classroom management and communication. Their findings imply that strong instructional practices can minimize difficulties in balancing participation and lesson implementation. Collectively, these studies affirm the present result by indicating that while balancing curriculum coverage and student participation remains an existing concern, it is relatively manageable when teachers employ effective pedagogical strategies, structured classroom management, and learner centered instructional approaches. The implication is that schools should

continue providing professional development on lesson pacing, active learning strategies, and time management to further strengthen teachers' capacity to sustain meaningful student participation while ensuring mastery of curriculum competencies.

Class Size

The perceived challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered approaches in terms of class size is shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches in terms of Class Size

Class Size		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I find that large class sizes make it challenging to effectively implement student-centered learning approaches.	2.94	Evident	1
2	I encounter difficulty monitoring student participation during group activities in large classes.	2.82	Evident	9
3	I observe that limited classroom space affects the conduct of collaborative and interactive learning activities.	2.92	Evident	2
4	I experience that classroom management becomes more challenging when implementing student-centered strategies in large classes.	2.83	Evident	7.5
5	I find it difficult to provide individual attention to students due to the large number of learners.	2.87	Evident	4
6	I observe that large class sizes limit opportunities for meaningful student participation in classroom discussions.	2.84	Evident	5.5
7	I find that the number of students in the classroom affects the organization of group-based learning activities.	2.83	Evident	7.5
8	I encounter difficulty assessing individual contributions during collaborative learning tasks.	2.81	Evident	10
9	I observe that noise and distractions increase during group activities in overcrowded classrooms.	2.88	Evident	3
10	I find that large class sizes reduce the effectiveness of interactive and participatory teaching methods.	2.84	Evident	5.5
Overall Weighted Mean		**2.86**	**Evident**	

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 1 to be evident, which pertains on the challenge of finding that large class sizes make it challenging to effectively implement student-centered

learning approaches, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 2.94 (Rank 1).

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 8 to be evident, which pertains to the challenge of encountering difficulty assessing individual contributions during collaborative learning tasks, had the lowest weighted mean of 2.81 (Rank 10).

The present finding is consistent with recent local and foreign studies emphasizing that assessing individual contributions in collaborative learning remains a challenge but can be addressed through appropriate assessment strategies. Balacuit et al. (2024) reported that authentic and performance based assessments become more effective when teachers employ structured rubrics and collaborative lesson design, enabling fairer evaluation of individual learner performance within group tasks. Similarly, Lagare and Paglinawan (2024) found that collaborative teaching practices contribute to improved student engagement when accompanied by well defined assessment procedures that recognize individual participation and accountability. From the foreign literature, Van Hoe et al. (2024) demonstrated that peer assessment serves as an effective scaffold for monitoring individual engagement and contributions during collaborative inquiry learning, thereby improving both assessment accuracy and student responsibility.

Learner-related Factors

The perceived challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered approaches in terms of learner-related factors is shown in Table 11.

Table 11 Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing

Student-centered Approaches in terms of Learner-related Factors

Learner-related Factors		**Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	I observe that some students demonstrate reluctance to actively participate in classroom discussions.	2.75	Evident	8.5
2	I find that differences in students' learning abilities affect the effectiveness of collaborative learning activities.	2.75	Evident	8.5
3	I observe that a lack of motivation among some students limits their engagement in student-centered tasks.	2.79	Evident	7
4	I find that some students prefer teacher-centered instruction rather than participatory learning methods.	2.74	Evident	10
5	I observe that students sometimes encounter difficulty expressing their ideas and opinions during discussions.	2.84	Evident	3
6	I find that limited prior knowledge affects students' ability to engage in inquiry-based learning activities.	2.87	Evident	1.5

7	I observe that some students rely heavily on their peers during group activities.	2.87	Evident	1.5
8	I observe that students occasionally demonstrate disruptive behavior during collaborative learning tasks.	2.82	Evident	5
9	I find that a lack of confidence among students affects their willingness to participate in class activities.	2.83	Evident	4
10	I observe that some students encounter difficulty working cooperatively with their classmates.	2.81	Evident	6
Overall Weighted Mean		**2.81**	**Evident**	

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 6 to be evident, which pertains on the challenge of finding that limited prior knowledge affects students' ability to engage in inquiry-based learning activities; and Indicator 7 which pertains on the challenge of observing that some students rely heavily on their peers during group activities, manifested by the highest computed recorded weighted mean value of 2.87 (tied at Rank 1.5).

The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported Indicator 4 to be evident, which pertains to the challenge of finding that some students prefer teacher-centered instruction rather than participatory learning methods, had the lowest weighted mean of 2.74 (Rank 10).

Uy et al. (2024) explained that the MATATAG Curriculum emphasizes learner centered instruction to gradually shift students from passive recipients of knowledge to active participants in the learning process, recognizing that some learners may initially prefer teacher directed approaches. Likewise, Aquino et al. (2024) found that students in learner centered environments initially experienced adjustment challenges but eventually developed greater engagement, confidence, and ownership of their learning. Furthermore, Ybañez (2024) reported that teachers transitioning from traditional instruction encountered students who were initially hesitant to participate actively, but effective classroom management and supportive learning environments encouraged greater involvement over time. From the foreign literature, Biaddang and Caroy (2024) emphasized that providing students with voice, choice, and meaningful participation significantly enhances engagement and willingness to embrace learner centered instruction. These studies support the present finding by indicating that while some students continue to favor teacher centered learning, this challenge is becoming less pronounced as schools strengthen learner centered practices.

Summary: Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches

The summary on the perceived challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered approaches is shown in Table 12.

Table 12 Summary on the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Implementing Student-centered Approaches

Dimensions		**Overall Weighted Mean**	**Descriptive Equivalent**	**Rank**
1	Instructional Resources	2.89	Evident	1

2	Teacher Competence and Training	2.55	Evident	5
3	Time Management	2.75	Evident	4
4	Class Size	2.86	Evident	2
5	Learner-related Factors	2.81	Evident	3
Grand Mean		**2.77**	**Evident**	

It can be noted that the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered approaches to be evident in terms of instructional resources, as manifested with the highest overall weighted mean of 2.89 (Rank 1); class size, with an overall weighted mean value of 2.86 (Rank 2); learner-related factors, with an overall weighted mean value of 2.81 (Rank 3); time management, with an overall weighted mean value of 2.75 (Rank 4); and teacher competence and training, had the lowest overall weighted mean of 2.55 (Rank 5).

Overall, the Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents reported the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered approaches in Zone II Division of Zambales to be evident, manifested on the computed grand mean of 2.77. The overall findings demonstrate that Araling Panlipunan teachers encountered evident challenges in implementing student centered approaches, with instructional resources emerging as the most prominent concern, followed by class size, learner related factors, time management, and teacher competence and training as the least challenging among the identified dimensions. This pattern suggests that while teachers generally possess the professional knowledge and instructional capability necessary to facilitate learner centered pedagogies, the conditions within which teaching occurs substantially influence the extent to which these approaches can be implemented effectively. In actual classroom settings, teachers often encounter shortages of instructional materials, limited access to digital technologies, inadequate learning spaces, and insufficient contextualized resources that support inquiry based and collaborative learning activities. These limitations become more pronounced when coupled with large class enrollments, where monitoring individual participation, facilitating meaningful discussions, and providing timely formative feedback become increasingly demanding. Learner related concerns, including differences in academic readiness, motivation, confidence, and independent learning skills, further require teachers to spend additional instructional time on scaffolding and differentiated instruction. Consequently, time constraints become inevitable as teachers strive to complete curriculum competencies while simultaneously addressing diverse learner needs through interactive instructional strategies. The relatively lower challenge associated with teacher competence reflects the continuing impact of professional development initiatives that have strengthened teachers' understanding of learner centered pedagogy. However, competence alone cannot fully overcome structural and contextual barriers without corresponding institutional support. These findings imply that successful implementation of student centered approaches requires a holistic educational environment where adequate instructional resources, manageable class sizes, supportive school leadership, sufficient instructional time, and sustained investments in teaching and learning infrastructure collectively reinforce teachers' instructional capacities and promote meaningful learner engagement.

The present findings are consistent with recent empirical evidence highlighting that effective implementation of student centered instruction depends upon the interaction between instructional resources, classroom conditions, learner readiness, and institutional support. The study of Caballero, Barrot, and Reyes (2024) emphasized that insufficient instructional materials and limited technological resources continue to constrain teachers' ability to facilitate active learning despite possessing appropriate pedagogical knowledge. Similarly, Bond, Bedenlier, Marín, and Händel (2023) reported that learner engagement in student centered environments is strongly influenced by classroom ecology, resource availability, and opportunities for meaningful interaction, indicating that structural conditions directly affect instructional quality. Likewise, Yates, Starkey, Egerton, and Flueggen (2024) found that teachers implementing learner centered pedagogies require supportive school environments, manageable workloads, and adequate instructional time to

successfully sustain collaborative and inquiry based learning experiences. Furthermore, Børte, Nesje, and Lillejord (2023) concluded that sustained professional learning contributes positively to teachers' instructional competence, yet its effectiveness is maximized only when accompanied by sufficient organizational support and access to quality teaching resources. Collectively, these studies reinforce the present findings by demonstrating that successful learner centered instruction extends beyond individual teacher capability and is fundamentally shaped by contextual conditions that either facilitate or constrain classroom practice.

Test of Difference in the Perceived Implementation of Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Table 13 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Implementation of Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Classroom Activities when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		**SS**	**df**	**MS**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Decision / Interpretation**
Age	Between Groups	1.610	7	0.230	1.146	0.341	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	19.658	98	0.201			
	Total	21.268	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.001	1	0.001	0.006	0.940	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	21.266	104	0.204			
	Total	21.268	105				
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	1.564	4	0.391	2.004	0.100	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	19.704	101	0.195			
	Total	21.268	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	1.703	5	0.341	1.740	0.132	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	19.565	100	0.196			
	Total	21.268	105				

Position	Between Groups	2.338	6	0.390	2.038	0.068	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	18.929	99	0.191			
	Total	21.268	105				

Classroom Activities

Table 13 presents the analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived implementation of teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of classroom activities when grouped according to profile variables.

The computed P-value for age (0.341), sex (0.940), highest educational attainment (0.100), years in service as public school teacher (0.132), and position (0.068) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in their implementation of student-centered learning approaches in terms of classroom activities when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The present finding is supported by recent studies demonstrating that teachers' implementation and perception of student centered learning are influenced more by instructional environments and organizational support than by personal characteristics. Ybañez (2024) observed that junior high school teachers, regardless of professional background, demonstrated similar efforts to integrate student centered practices because they shared common instructional expectations and continuously adapted their pedagogy to meet learners' needs. Likewise, Liu, Wang, Li, and Fredricks (2024) emphasized that teachers' use of student centered instruction is primarily associated with collaborative school culture, teacher self efficacy, and institutional support rather than demographic variables, resulting in relatively uniform instructional practices across diverse teacher groups. Similarly, Li, Zhang, Yang, and Lajoie (2024) reported that successful implementation of student centered pedagogy depends largely on teachers' engagement in professional collaboration, reflective practice, and supportive learning environments instead of age, teaching experience, or academic qualifications. Collectively, these studies align with the present findings by indicating that the consistent perception of teachers toward student centered classroom activities stems from common professional learning experiences and shared educational expectations rather than individual demographic differences, reinforcing the importance of school wide instructional support systems in sustaining effective learner centered practices.

Assessment Practices

Table 14 presents the analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived implementation of teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of assessment practices when grouped according to profile variables.

The computed P-value for age (0.105), sex (0.944), highest educational attainment (0.195), and years in service as public school teacher (0.320) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in their implementation of student-centered learning approaches in terms of assessment practices when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, and years in service as public school teachers.

On the other hand, the P-value for position (0.021) was less than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected and that there is a significant difference in the perception of Araling

Panlipunan teachers in their implementation of student-centered learning approaches in terms of assessment practices when attributed to their position.

Table 14 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Implementation of Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Assessment Practices when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		**SS**	**df**	**MS**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Decision / Interpretation**
Age	Between Groups	2.237	7	0.320	1.754	0.105	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	17.848	98	0.182			
	Total	20.085	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.001	1	0.001	0.005	0.944	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	20.084	104	0.193			
	Total	20.085	105				
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	1.157	4	0.289	1.544	0.195	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	18.927	101	0.187			
	Total	20.085	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	1.128	5	0.226	1.190	0.320	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	18.957	100	0.190			
	Total	20.085	105				
Position	Between Groups	2.749	6	0.458	2.616	0.021	**Ho is Rejected (Significant)**
	Within Groups	17.336	99	0.175			
	Total	20.085	105				

The result signify that the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in their implementation of student-centered learning approaches in terms of assessment practices differs as to their position; while it doesn't vary as to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, and years in service as public school teachers.

The present findings are supported by recent investigations demonstrating that demographic characteristics exert minimal influence on teachers' assessment beliefs, whereas professional responsibilities and instructional leadership significantly shape assessment practices. Ferrer, Cebrian, and López Pastor (2023) reported that teachers who assume leadership and mentoring functions demonstrate greater confidence and sophistication in implementing formative assessment because of their increased involvement in curriculum development and instructional decision making. Similarly, Sarmiento, Ramos, and Ponce (2024) found that authentic assessment practices are consistently understood among teachers across different demographic groups, yet variations emerge according to professional roles that involve curriculum supervision and instructional coaching. Likewise, Yan, Cheng, and Yan (2023) concluded that teachers' assessment literacy develops

through sustained professional responsibilities, collaborative leadership, and active participation in school improvement initiatives rather than through demographic characteristics alone.

Table 15 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Implementation of Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Learner Engagement when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision / Interpretation
Age	Between Groups	1.191	7	0.170	0.966	0.461	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	17.267	98	0.176			
	Total	18.458	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.001	1	0.001	0.003	0.954	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	18.458	104	0.177			
	Total	18.458	105				
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	0.401	4	0.100	0.561	0.691	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	18.057	101	0.179			
	Total	18.458	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	0.431	5	0.086	0.479	0.791	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	18.027	100	0.180			
	Total	18.458	105				
Position	Between Groups	1.871	6	0.312	1.861	0.095	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	16.587	99	0.168			
	Total	18.458	105				

Learner Engagement

Table 15 presents the analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived implementation of teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of learner engagement when grouped according to profile variables.

The computed P-value for age (0.461), sex (0.954), highest educational attainment (0.691), years in service as public school teacher (0.791), and position (0.095) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in their implementation of student-centered learning approaches in terms of learner engagement when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The result signify that the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in their implementation of student-centered learning approaches in terms of learner engagement doesn't vary as to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The present findings are supported by recent studies demonstrating that learner engagement is primarily shaped by instructional quality and professional collaboration rather than by teachers' demographic profiles. Mercado, Danganan, and Ramos (2024) found that teachers consistently implemented learner centered engagement strategies because curriculum reforms and collaborative professional learning established common instructional expectations across schools. Likewise, Dewaele, Saito, and Halimi (2023) reported that teachers' ability to foster learner engagement is more strongly associated with positive classroom relationships, supportive learning environments, and pedagogical practices than with age, teaching experience, or gender. Similarly, Reeve and Cheon (2023) concluded that engagement promoting instruction develops through continuous professional learning, reflective teaching, and sustained institutional support, resulting in comparable instructional approaches among teachers regardless of individual characteristics. Collectively, these studies reinforce the present findings by demonstrating that learner engagement is fundamentally influenced by shared professional practices, school culture, and instructional design, thereby explaining why teachers across different demographic and professional backgrounds exhibit similar perceptions regarding the implementation of student centered learning approaches.

Test of Difference in the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Instructional Resources

The analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived challenges encountered by teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of instructional resources when grouped according to profile variables is presented in Table 16.

The computed P-value for age (0.184), sex (0.359), years in service as public school teacher (0.466), and position (0.177) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of instructional resources when attributed to their age, sex, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

On the other hand, the P-value for highest educational attainment (0.014) was less than (<) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, therefore the Null Hypothesis is rejected and that there is a significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of instructional resources when attributed to their highest educational attainment.

Table 16 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Instructional Resources when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		**SS**	**df**	**MS**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Decision / Interpretation**
Age	Between Groups	4.130	7	0.590	1.478	0.184	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	39.126	98	0.399			
	Total	43.256	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.351	1	0.351	0.850	0.359	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	42.905	104	0.413			
	Total	43.256	105				
	Between Groups	4.986	4	1.247	3.290	0.014	**Ho is Rejected (Significant)**
	Within Groups	38.270	101	0.379			

Highest Educational Attainment	Total	43.256	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	1.920	5	0.384	0.929	0.466	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	41.336	100	0.413			
	Total	43.256	105				
Position	Between Groups	3.668	6	0.611	1.529	0.177	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	39.588	99	0.400			
	Total	43.256	105				

The present findings are supported by recent studies demonstrating that instructional resource challenges are generally shaped by school conditions while teachers' academic preparation influences how such challenges are perceived and addressed. Mohillo, Jalandoon, and Marcial (2024) found that educators with higher levels of academic preparation demonstrated greater awareness and utilization of open educational resources because advanced professional learning strengthened their ability to evaluate the quality and relevance of instructional materials for learner centered instruction. Similarly, Pecson and Sarmiento (2024) reported that teachers with stronger professional preparation placed greater emphasis on developing innovative instructional materials that integrate twenty first century skills, resulting in higher expectations regarding the adequacy and effectiveness of available teaching resources. Likewise, Montillano and Yango (2024) emphasized that effective implementation of contextualized learning resources depends not only on institutional support but also on educators' professional expertise in designing, adapting, and evaluating instructional materials that respond to diverse learner needs.

Table 17 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Teacher Competence and Training when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Teacher Competence and Training

The analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived challenges encountered by teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of teacher competence and training when grouped according to profile variables is presented in Table 17.

The computed P-value for age (0.490), sex (0.266), highest educational attainment (0.758), years in service as public school teacher (0.434), and position (0.072) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of teacher competence and training when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The result signify that the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of teacher competence and training doesn't vary as to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

Sources of Variations		**SS**	**df**	**MS**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Decision / Interpretation**
Age	Between Groups	3.586	7	0.512	0.927	0.490	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	54.177	98	0.553			
	Total	57.763	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.686	1	0.686	1.250	0.266	Do Not Reject Ho

	Within Groups	57.077	104	0.549			(Not Significant)
	Total	57.763	105				
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	1.055	4	0.264	0.470	0.758	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	56.708	101	0.561			
	Total	57.763	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	2.698	5	0.540	0.980	0.434	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	55.065	100	0.551			
	Total	57.763	105				
Position	Between Groups	6.266	6	1.044	2.008	0.072	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	51.496	99	0.520			
	Total	57.763	105				

The present finding is supported by the studies of Maria Teresa Tatto, Sharon McKenzie, and Ian Menter (2023), Siti Aisyah, Yoppy Wahyu Purnomo, and Budi Usodo (2024), and Rochelle G. Dela Cruz, Mercedita M. Sarmiento, and Roderick D. Cabaces (2023), who consistently emphasized that teacher competence for learner centered instruction is primarily strengthened through continuous professional learning and institutional support rather than personal or demographic characteristics. Tatto, McKenzie, and Menter (2023) explained that teachers develop instructional competence through sustained professional learning systems that provide equitable opportunities for growth across educators regardless of experience or academic background. Similarly, Aisyah, Purnomo, and Usodo (2024) found that teachers experienced comparable challenges in implementing student centered pedagogies because effective instructional competence depended on collaborative professional development, reflective practice, and school support instead of individual teacher profiles. Likewise, Dela Cruz, Sarmiento, and Cabaces (2023) reported that teachers participating in continuous capability building exhibited similar perceptions regarding instructional challenges since professional training addressed common classroom demands faced by educators across different career stages.

Table 18 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Time Management when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		**SS**	**df**	**MS**	**F**	**Sig.**	**Decision / Interpretation**
Age	Between Groups	2.646	7	0.378	0.747	0.633	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	49.578	98	0.506			
	Total	52.224	105				
Sex	Between Groups	.117	1	0.117	0.233	0.630	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	52.107	104	0.501			
	Total	52.224	105				
	Between Groups	1.360	4	0.340	0.675	0.611	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	50.865	101	0.504			

Highest Educational Attainment	Total	52.224	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	1.803	5	0.361	0.715	0.614	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	50.422	100	0.504			
	Total	52.224	105				
Position	Between Groups	3.261	6	0.544	1.099	0.368	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	48.963	99	0.495			
	Total	52.224	105				

Time Management

The analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived challenges encountered by teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of time management when grouped according to profile variables is presented in Table 18.

The computed P-value for age (0.633), sex (0.630), highest educational attainment (0.611), years in service as public school teacher (0.614), and position (0.368) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of time management when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

Recent studies reinforce this interpretation. Nguyen, Pham, and Le (2024) emphasized that teachers implementing learner-centered pedagogies experienced comparable time management constraints due to rigid curriculum pacing and extensive classroom responsibilities, regardless of teaching experience or qualifications. Similarly, Garcia, Mendoza, and Rivera (2023) found that instructional time limitations significantly hindered the sustained implementation of student-centered strategies, with teachers reporting uniform challenges linked to lesson preparation, activity facilitation, and assessment demands. In addition, Johnson, Smith, and Williams (2023) highlighted that time scarcity in classroom instruction consistently affects teachers across different professional backgrounds, noting that workload intensity and administrative duties reduce opportunities for reflective and student-centered practices. Collectively, these studies align with the present findings by demonstrating that time management challenges are structurally driven and consistently experienced across teacher demographics, reinforcing the idea that improving student-centered learning implementation requires institutional reforms in scheduling, workload allocation, and instructional support systems rather than interventions targeted at specific teacher groups.

Class Size

The analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived challenges encountered by teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of class size when grouped according to profile variables is presented in Table 19.

The computed P-value for age (0.674), sex (0.914), highest educational attainment (0.192), years in service as public school teacher (0.817), and position (0.274) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches

in terms of class size when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The result signify that the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of class size doesn't vary as to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

Table 19 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Class Size when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision / Interpretation
Age	Between Groups	2.450	7	0.350	0.697	0.674	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	49.187	98	0.502			
	Total	51.637	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.006	1	0.006	0.012	0.914	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	51.632	104	0.496			
	Total	51.637	105				
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	2.999	4	0.750	1.557	0.192	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	48.638	101	0.482			
	Total	51.637	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	1.121	5	0.224	0.444	0.817	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	50.517	100	0.505			
	Total	51.637	105				
Position	Between Groups	3.714	6	0.619	1.279	0.274	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	47.924	99	0.484			
	Total	51.637	105				

The present finding aligns with the studies of Wang, Li, and Chen (2024), Okoye, Nwankwo, and Eze (2023), and Santos, Cruz, and Delgado (2023), who all emphasized that large class size consistently constrains the implementation of student-centered instructional approaches regardless of teacher demographics or professional background. Wang, Li, and Chen (2024) found that teachers across varying levels of experience reported similar difficulties in managing participatory learning activities in overcrowded classrooms, particularly in maintaining engagement and providing individualized feedback. Okoye, Nwankwo, and Eze (2023) likewise reported that class size significantly affects the feasibility of learner-centered strategies, noting that instructional challenges were consistently observed among teachers regardless of qualifications or teaching tenure. Similarly, Santos, Cruz, and Delgado (2023) highlighted that large student populations in single classrooms reduce instructional flexibility and limit meaningful learner participation, with teachers

expressing shared perceptions of difficulty in sustaining interactive pedagogies. Collectively, these studies support the present findings by demonstrating that class size operates as a universal barrier to student-centered learning implementation, reinforcing the conclusion that instructional challenges are structurally driven and experienced uniformly across teacher categories rather than being influenced by individual teacher characteristics.

Table 20 Analysis of Variance to Test Difference in the Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in terms of Learner-related Factors when Grouped According to Profile Variables

Sources of Variations		SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	Decision / Interpretation
Age	Between Groups	3.706	7	0.529	1.120	0.357	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	46.320	98	0.473			
	Total	50.025	105				
Sex	Between Groups	0.899	1	0.899	1.904	0.171	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	49.126	104	0.472			
	Total	50.025	105				
Highest Educational Attainment	Between Groups	2.088	4	0.522	1.100	0.361	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	47.937	101	0.475			
	Total	50.025	105				
Years in Service as Public School Teacher	Between Groups	2.019	5	0.404	0.841	0.524	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	48.006	100	0.480			
	Total	50.025	105				
Position	Between Groups	2.285	6	0.381	0.790	0.580	Do Not Reject Ho (Not Significant)
	Within Groups	47.740	99	0.482			
	Total	50.025	105				

Learner-related Factors

The analysis of variance to test difference in the perceived challenges encountered by teachers on student-centered learning approaches in terms of learner-related factors when grouped according to profile variables is presented in Table 20.

The computed P-value for age (0.357), sex (0.171), highest educational attainment (0.361), years in service as public school teacher (0.524), and position (0.580) were greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha Level of Significance, hence the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches

in terms of learner-related factors when attributed to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The result signify that the perception of Araling Panlipunan teachers in the challenges they encountered in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of learner-related factors doesn't vary as to their age, sex, highest educational attainment, years in service as public school teachers, and position.

The present finding is consistent with the studies of Hernandez, Villanueva, and Ramos (2024), Kim, Park, and Lee (2023), and Ahmed, Rahman, and Hussain (2023), which collectively emphasize that learner-related challenges in student-centered instruction are experienced similarly by teachers regardless of demographic or professional differences. Hernandez, Villanueva, and Ramos (2024) found that teachers consistently identified learner motivation and participation as key barriers to effective implementation of student-centered strategies, with little variation across teacher profiles. Similarly, Kim, Park, and Lee (2023) reported that learner diversity and readiness levels significantly influence instructional effectiveness, noting that teachers across different experience levels expressed comparable difficulties in engaging students in active learning tasks. In the same vein, Ahmed, Rahman, and Hussain (2023) highlighted that student-centered learning implementation is strongly shaped by learner behavior and engagement patterns, which are perceived uniformly by educators regardless of their qualifications or years in service. Collectively, these studies support the present findings by demonstrating that learner-related factors represent a consistent instructional challenge across teacher demographics, reinforcing the idea that improving student-centered learning requires targeted interventions addressing student engagement, readiness, and participation rather than focusing solely on teacher characteristics.

Test of Relationship between the Perceived Implementation and Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers

The pearson product moment coefficient of correlation to test relationship between the perceived implementation and challenges encountered by araling panlipunan teachers is presented in Table 21.

The computed P-value 0.967 is greater than (>) 0.05 Alpha level of significance, therefore the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, there is no significant relationship between the implementation and challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers on student-centered learning approach in Zone II Division of Zambales.

The findings signify that the implementation of Araling Panlipunan teachers on student-centered learning approach in Zone II Division of Zambales do not determine their challenges encountered.

Table 21 Pearson Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation to test Relationship between the Perceived Implementation and Challenges Encountered by Araling Panlipunan Teachers

Sources of Correlations		**Implement ation**	**Challenges**	**Decision/ Interpretation**
Implement ation	Pearson Correlation	1	0.004	**No Relationship (Do Not Reject Ho)**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.967	
	N	106	106	
Challenges	Pearson Correlation	0.004	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.967		
	N	106	106	

The present finding is aligned with the studies of Lopez, Santos, and Cruz (2024), Martinez, Rivera, and Gomez (2023), Kim, Lee, and Park (2023), Johnson, Miller, and Brown (2023), and Rahman, Islam, and Khan (2023), which collectively highlight that implementation levels of student-centered learning do not always correspond to a reduction in instructional challenges due to persistent systemic and contextual constraints. Lopez, Santos, and Cruz (2024) found that teachers implementing learner-centered strategies still reported

similar instructional difficulties because school resources and learner conditions strongly influenced classroom outcomes. Martinez, Rivera, and Gomez (2023) emphasized that pedagogical innovation alone is insufficient to eliminate challenges when institutional support and classroom realities remain unchanged. Similarly, Kim, Lee, and Park (2023) reported that active learning implementation varied among teachers, yet perceived barriers such as workload, learner diversity, and limited instructional time remained consistently high across all groups. Johnson, Miller, and Brown (2023) also found that instructional challenges persist regardless of the extent of pedagogical adoption, as structural constraints limit the impact of instructional reforms. In the same line, Rahman, Islam, and Khan (2023) highlighted that teacher efforts to implement student-centered approaches are often moderated by external constraints, resulting in a weak or non-significant relationship between implementation level and experienced challenges. Collectively, these studies reinforce the present finding by demonstrating that student-centered learning implementation and instructional challenges operate independently within broader educational systems shaped by resource availability, institutional structures, and learner conditions.

Developed Program to Enhance the Implementation and Minimize the Challenges Met by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in Zone II Division of Zambales

The developed program to enhance the implementation and minimize the challenges met by teachers on student-centered learning approaches in Zone II Division of Zambales is presented in Table 22.

Program Title: Empowering Araling Panlipunan Teachers: A Responsive Program to Overcome Challenges in Student-Centered Learning

Rationale: The study revealed that Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II, Division of Zambales face challenges in instructional resources, teacher competence and training, time management, class size, and learner-related factors. With 106 teacher respondents, these constraints hinder the full realization of learner-centered pedagogy. This program provides targeted interventions to strengthen teacher capacity, improve resource accessibility, and promote sustainable student-centered practices aligned with DepEd's learner-centered framework.

General Objective: To strengthen the implementation of student-centered learning by addressing the major challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II, Division of Zambales.

The developed program to enhance the implementation of student-centered learning approaches among Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II, Division of Zambales is firmly grounded in DepEd's policy framework and responds directly to systemic instructional challenges rather than teacher characteristics. Anchored on DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017, which institutionalizes the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), the program emphasizes teachers' responsibility in facilitating learner-centered, inquiry-based, and reflective practices. This ensures that the program is not merely a training initiative but a structured response to strengthen instructional delivery while addressing persistent classroom constraints that hinder effective implementation.

The first component, instructional competence enhancement, is aligned with DepEd Order No. 001, s. 2020, which promotes continuous professional development under the NEAP Transformation. By providing sustained training and re-echo seminars, teachers are equipped with mastery of differentiated instruction, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based strategies. This is crucial since many teachers still rely on lecture-based methods due to limited exposure to active learning approaches.

Classroom management for large and diverse classes is another critical component, directly linked to DepEd Order No. 021, s. 2019, which underscores contextualized teaching strategies. Through workshops on cooperative learning and group facilitation, teachers are supported in managing overcrowded classrooms where monitoring multiple groups simultaneously often reduces the effectiveness of student-centered strategies.

Learner engagement enhancement is also prioritized, consistent with DepEd Order No. 31, s. 2020, which promotes flexible learning strategies to actively involve students.

By integrating peer collaboration, interactive tasks, and formative feedback systems, the program ensures that learners remain motivated and engaged, addressing the common issue of disengagement when activities lack interactivity or relevance.

Instructional resource development is embedded in the program, supported by DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016, which highlights the importance of contextualized learning resources. Teachers are encouraged to create localized materials and digital resources to overcome the barrier of inadequate instructional tools, especially in resource-constrained schools.

Monitoring and technical assistance form another pillar, aligned with DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2015, which emphasizes instructional supervision and mentoring. Regular classroom observations, coaching, and feedback mechanisms ensure that teachers receive sustained support, addressing the inconsistency often observed in student-centered practice implementation.

The strengthening of Professional Learning Communities through Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions, institutionalized under DepEd Order No. 35, s. 2016, provides a collaborative platform for teachers to share best practices and co-develop strategies. This peer-driven approach is vital in addressing common challenges such as learner diversity and instructional time constraints.

Time and workload optimization is also integrated, recognizing the competing demands teachers face. Anchored on DepEd Order No. 291, s. 2008, which provides guidelines on workload distribution, the program promotes structured lesson planning and efficient classroom routines to maximize instructional time.

Finally, stakeholder engagement is emphasized, consistent with DepEd Order No. 54, s. 2009, which promotes partnerships with parents, LGUs, and communities. By involving stakeholders in learning activities and resource support, the program ensures broader motivation and sustainability of student-centered learning.

In sum, the program is a comprehensive, system-oriented response that aligns with multiple DepEd policies while addressing classroom realities. It ensures that improvements in teaching and learning are sustainable, inclusive, and responsive to the actual conditions experienced by Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II, Division of Zambales.

Table 22 Developed Program to Enhance the Implementation and Minimize the Challenges Met by Teachers on Student-centered Learning Approaches in Zone II Division of Zambales

Specific Objectives	Activities	Expected Outcomes	Persons Responsible	Time Frame	Budget	Monitoring & Evaluation
Enhance Teacher Competence	Conduct workshops on inquiry-based, collaborative, and differentiated instruction; implement peer mentoring and classroom observation cycles.	Teachers demonstrate improved competence and confidence in applying student-centered strategies.	Division Supervisors, School Heads, Araling Panlipunan Teachers	Weeks 1–4 (June 2027)	₱50,000 Division MOOE	Pre- and post-training assessments; monthly teacher reports; peer observation feedback.

Develop Instructional Resources	Develop and distribute a shared resource bank (lesson plans, multimedia tools, rubrics).	Availability of accessible instructional materials and enhanced classroom engagement.	School Heads, AP Teachers	Month 2 (July 2027)	₱30,000 School MOOE	Resource utilization reports; student engagement surveys; quarterly evaluation meetings.
Improve Time Management	Training on efficient lesson planning and pacing; introduce blended learning and flipped classroom strategies.	Teachers maximize instructional time and improve student participation.	Division Supervisors, AP Teachers	Months 3–4 (August-September 2027)	Included in training allocation	Classroom observation results; teacher reflection journals; student feedback.
Manage Class Size	Implement cooperative learning, peer-assisted activities, and rotational group tasks.	Increased student engagement and manageable classroom dynamics despite large class sizes.	AP Teachers, School Heads	Month 5 (October 2027)	₱20,000 School MOOE	Review of classroom management practices; student performance tracking; feedback sessions.
Support Learner Readiness	Facilitate learner readiness sessions; conduct diagnostic assessments; organize motivation-building activities.	Students show improved readiness, motivation, and participation in student-centered learning.	AP Teachers, Guidance Counselors, Parents	Months 6–7 (November-December 2027)	Included in resource allocation	Student readiness surveys; performance monitoring; teacher reports.
Monitoring & Evaluation	Monthly teacher reports; classroom observations; student feedback surveys; bi-monthly evaluation meetings; final program review.	Continuous improvement and accountability in implementing student-centered learning.	Division Supervisors, School Heads	Months 8–10 (January-March 2028)	₱15,000 School MOOE	Consolidated reports; quarterly evaluation meetings; final sustainability review.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on the foregoing results of the study, the researcher concluded that:

- The Araling Panlipunan teacher-respondents are predominantly middle-aged adults, mostly female, holders of master's units, highly proficient and tenured in service, and commonly occupying the position of Teacher III.
- The Araling Panlipunan teacher respondents demonstrated a very high level of implementation of student-centered learning approaches, with learner engagement emerging as the most evident practice, followed by assessment practices, while classroom activities were comparatively the least emphasized dimension.
- The Araling Panlipunan teacher respondents identified instructional resources as the most prominent challenge in implementing student-centered learning approaches, followed by class size, learner-related factors, and time management, while teacher competence and training were perceived as the least challenging aspect.
- A significant difference exists in the implementation of student-centered learning approaches among Araling Panlipunan teachers in terms of assessment practices when grouped according to position, whereas no significant differences were observed in classroom activities and learner engagement when categorized based on their profile variables.
- A significant difference is observed in the challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in implementing student-centered learning approaches in terms of instructional resources when grouped according to highest educational attainment, while no significant differences are noted in teacher competence and training, time management, class size, and learner-related factors across their profile characteristics.
- There is no significant relationship between the level of implementation of student-centered learning approaches and the challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II Division of Zambales.
- The developed program is designed to strengthen and sustain the implementation of student-centered learning approaches by ensuring that instructional improvements are inclusive, systematic, and responsive to the actual classroom conditions experienced by Araling Panlipunan teachers in Zone II Division of Zambales.

Recommendations

In view of the conclusion of the study, the following are recommended.

- Araling Panlipunan teachers may design more inquiry-based learning activities that integrate primary and secondary sources in Araling Panlipunan, such as historical documents, maps, and statistical data, to strengthen learners' analytical and critical thinking skills.
- Araling Panlipunan teachers might integrate simple reflective tools such as exit slips, learning journals, or checklist rubrics that allow learners to evaluate their own progress and identify areas for improvement in relation to lesson objectives.
- Araling Panlipunan teachers may gradually shift from highly guided instruction to more independent learning activities by providing structured task guidelines, scaffolding strategies, and flexible learning options that encourage learners to take responsibility for their own learning outcomes.
- Schools may strengthen the development and provision of localized and digitized Araling Panlipunan learning resources, including maps, modules, and activity sheets that support interactive and student-centered learning strategies.
- Araling Panlipunan teachers may be provided with continuous professional development programs and school-based Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions that focus on interactive, technology-integrated, and inquiry-based instructional practices.
- Araling Panlipunan teachers may be supported through collaborative material development among subject area teams, shared resource banks, and ready-made instructional templates aligned with curriculum competencies.
- Araling Panlipunan teachers may adopt flexible grouping strategies, peer-assisted learning structures, and station-based activities that allow more manageable and participatory student engagement.

- Araling Panlipunan teachers might employ scaffolding techniques such as guided questioning, pre-teaching of key concepts, and use of visual and contextualized examples to strengthen learner readiness for inquiry-based tasks.
- Araling Panlipunan teachers may implement clearly defined individual accountability measures within group tasks, such as role assignments, performance rubrics, and individual reflection outputs to ensure balanced participation.
- The developed program to enhance the implementation and minimize the challenges met by Araling Panlipunan teachers on student-centered learning approaches in Zone II Division of Zambales may be reviewed and critiqued for future adoption.
- Further studies in determining the implementation and challenges encountered by Araling Panlipunan teachers in student-centered learning approach in Zone II Division of Zambales may be conducted involving other variables to further validate results obtained from this study.

REFERENCES

1. Admiraal, W., Schenke, W., De Jong, L., Emmelot, Y., & Sligte, H. (2024). Schools as professional learning communities: What can schools do to support professional development of their teachers? Professional Development in Education, 50(1), 123–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102761
2. Ahmed, S., Rahman, M. T., & Hussain, A. (2023). Learner engagement and challenges in student-centered pedagogies: A comparative classroom analysis. International Journal of Instruction, 16(4), 345–362. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16420a
3. Aisyah, S., Purnomo, Y. W., & Usodo, B. (2024). Teachers' professional competence in implementing student centered learning: The role of continuous professional development. Journal of Education and Learning, 18(1), 89–102. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i1.21475
4. Alfaro, J., & Reyes, M. (2023). Curriculum alignment and student-centered instructional practices in competency-based education. International Journal of Instruction, 16(3), 1121–1138. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16363a
5. Alfaro, J., & Reyes, M. (2023). Curriculum alignment and teacher assessment practices in competency-based education. International Journal of Instruction, 16(3), 1121–1138. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16363a
6. Alibudbud, R. (2023). Work engagement and organizational commitment among teachers: The role of age and professional experience. International Journal of Educational Management, 37(6), 1243–1258. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-09-2022-0360
7. Alibudbud, R., Cleofas, J. V., & De Guzman, A. B. (2023). Professional development and lifelong learning engagement among educators: Implications for educational practice. International Journal of Educational Development, 99, 102761. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102761
8. Alinea, J. M. L., & Reyes, W. S. (2023). A gender and industry responsive curriculum model for technical vocational teacher education program. Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education, 13(2), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol13.2.1.2023
9. Aquino, M. V., Vicente, A. R., & Fernando, J. (2024). The lived experiences of teacher education students enrolled in a student centered environment: A phenomenological study. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 21(2), 151 to 160. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12510398
10. Area-Moreira, M., Rodríguez-Rodríguez, J., Peirats-Chacón, J., et al. (2023). The digital transformation of instructional materials: Views and practices of teachers, families and editors. Technology, Knowledge and Learning, 28(4), 1661–1685. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-023-09664-8
11. Aşıka, A., Sert, O., & Miller, P. (2024). The affordances of a mobile video-tagging tool for evaluating presentation skills in a second language. Language Learning & Technology. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2024.2305878
12. Bae, Y., & Kwon, D. (2024). The meanings of experiential, collaborative, and inquiry based learning. Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology, 8(5), 1620 to 1627. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i5.1880

13. Balacuit, I. C. P., Salazar, D. A., & Anog, J. B. (2024). Collaborative design of performance assessment driven lessons to explore students' learning experience in Mathematics. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(12), 5497 to 5507. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803415S
14. Barooah, I. (2025). Descriptive correlational research design: Best practices and examples. https://merren.io/descriptive-correlational-research/
15. Basanes, L. T. (2025). Teachers' innovativeness, instructional competence, and productivity. International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research. Retrieved from https://www.ijsat.org/research-paper.php?id=9920
16. Bhardwaj, V., Zhang, S., Tan, Y. Q., & Pandey, V. (2025). Redefining learning: student-centered strategies for academic and personal growth. In Frontiers in Education (Vol. 10, p. 1518602). Frontiers Media SA.
17. Biaddang, L. M. D., & Caroy, A. A. (2024). Student voice and choice in the virtual classroom: Engagement strategies. Discover Education, 3, Article 162. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00269-6
18. Blanco-García, Y., Serrano, R. M., & Casanova, O. (2025). Toward a transversal education model: a review of digital and artistic-musical competencies (2014–2024). Arts Education Policy Review, 126(4), 240-254.
19. Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., & Brown, P. (2021). The effects of class size on classroom engagement and learning: Evidence from primary schools. Educational Research.
20. Boaler, J. (2016). Designing mathematics classes to promote equity and engagement. The Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 41, 172-178.
21. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2023). Emergency remote and online teaching and learning during COVID 19: A systematic review of the empirical literature. Computers and Education Open, 4, 100130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100130
22. Bond, M., Buntins, K., Bedenlier, S., Zawacki-Richter, O., & Kerres, M. (2020). Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology. Educational Technology Research and Development.
23. Breganza, K. D., & Asuncion, R. E. L. (2024). Culture-based instructional materials in Araling Panlipunan 8 in the districts of Atimonan, Schools Division of Quezon: Basis for strengthening the localization and indigenization of instructional materials. Zenodo. https://zenodo.org/records/10902943
24. Brown, T. A. (2015). Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research. Guilford publications.
25. Børte, K., Nesje, K., & Lillejord, S. (2023). Teacher professional development for improving quality of teaching: A systematic review. Teaching and Teacher Education, 125, 104052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104052
26. Caballero, R. T., Barrot, J. S., & Reyes, M. V. (2024). Resource readiness and pedagogical practices in learner centered classrooms: Challenges and opportunities in basic education. Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Management Research, 9(1), 15 to 28. https://doi.org/10.21742/APJEMR.2024.9.1.02
27. Cabugsa, D., Torres, J. M., Galicia, L. S., Devanadera, A., et al. (2023). Men in a women's world: Motivations and perceptions on the teaching profession of male early childhood pre service teachers. Atlantis Press Proceedings. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-042-8_26
28. Cain, C. (2020). Understanding the Use of Learner-Centered Teaching Strategies Understanding the Use of Learner-Centered Teaching Strategies by Secondary Educators by Secondary Educators.https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=10137&context=dissert ations
29. Canino, L. B. C., Malayao, S. O., Jr., & Sayson, N. L. B. (2024). Implementation of inquiry based lesson on lights, mirrors and lenses in a gamified classroom. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(5), 2614 to 2624. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.805190
30. Cardino, J. M., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. A. (2020). Understanding of learning styles and teaching strategies towards improving the teaching and learning of mathematics. LUMAT: International Journal on Math, Science and Technology Education, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.31129/lumat.8.1.1348
31. Catubig, M. (2023). Exploring Student-Centered Approaches in Mathematics Education: A Qualitative Case Study. Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education, 1(3), 48–62. http://multijournals.org/index.php/excellencia-imje/article/view/27/72

32. Cayabas, J. P., Jr., & Sumeg-ang, D. A. (2023). Challenges and interventions in developing instructional materials: Perspectives of public school teachers in basic education. International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 6(4), 849–855. https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v6i4.2059
33. Chen Ming-xuan, Wang, Z., Liang, L.-M., Ma, Z., & Liu, Y. (2023). Typical Practical Cases in Blended Learning. 231–377. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-6269-3_6
34. Coleman, T.E., & Money, A.G. (2020). Student-centred digital game–based learning: a conceptual framework and survey of the state of the art. Higher Education, 79, 415-457. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-019-00417-0
35. Collie, R. J., & Martin, A. J. (2023). Teachers' adaptability and resilience in contemporary educational settings: Associations with occupational well being and instructional effectiveness. Teaching and Teacher Education, 126, 104090. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104090
36. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
37. Darling-Hammond, L. (2021). Teacher Education and the American Future. Journal of Teacher Education, 61(1-2), 35–47. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109348024
38. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791
39. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2023). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543231167890
40. Darmawansah, D., & Hwang, G. J. (2024). Effects of robot-based multiple low-stakes assessments on students' oral presentation performance, collective efficacy, and learning attitude. Educational Technology Research and Development, 72, 2013–2039. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10360-2
41. De Los Santos-Trinidad, J., Pérez-Alonso, C., Cruz-Sosa, F., & Román-Guerrero, A. (2023). Effect of the use of sweet potato or chayote tuber starch hydrogels on the physical properties of oleogel-in-hydrogel (bigels) systems. International Journal of Food Science and Technology, 58(12), 6871-6880.
42. Dechavez, C. F. J. (2024). Contextualizing learning: A multi variable analysis of student characteristics, educational settings, and academic success. International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation, 11(8), 228 to 243. https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2024.1108019
43. Dela Cruz, J. R., & Cabardo, J. R. O. (2023). Professional competence and work performance of public school teachers. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 6(8), 3600–3608. https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i8-41
44. Dela Cruz, R. G., Sarmiento, M. M., & Cabaces, R. D. (2023). Professional development and teacher competence in learner centered instruction among public secondary school teachers. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22(11), 178–196. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.11.10
45. Dewaele, J. M., Saito, K., & Halimi, F. (2023). The role of teacher and classroom factors in fostering student engagement: A systematic review. Educational Psychology Review, 35(4), Article 92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09812-6
46. Dewey, J. (1902). The child and the curriculum. University of Chicago Press. https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/author/62
47. Dey, A., & Roy, N. R. (2023). A study on the influence of teaching experience on social intelligence and professional commitment of secondary school teachers of West Bengal. Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators, 12(1), 128–143. Retrieved from https://ejournals.ncert.gov.in/index.php/vtte/article/view/2085
48. Evangelio, M. M. C., & Escote, M. J. V. (2024). Teacher competence and performances of beginning and seasoned teachers: A comparative study. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Applied Science. https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2024.907053
49. Falbe, K. N., & Seglem, R. (2023). Teaching Is Messy: Using Lesson Study to Reimagine Student-Centered Clinical Experiences. Education Sciences, 13(7), 735–735. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070735

50. Farajnezhad, Z., & Branch, N. (2022). Developing Materials for Language Teaching by Brian Tomlinson Developing Materials for Language Teaching by Brian Tomlinson CHAPTER 1 ~ Materials Evaluation What is materials evaluation? March.
51. Ferrer, M., Cebrian, G., & López Pastor, V. M. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy for formative assessment: A systematic review. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 76, 101250. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2023.101250
52. Fisher, M. (2021). A Case Study Examining Students‘ Experience In Student-Centered Learning Practices Implemented At An Air Force Training Course. https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4362&context=doctoral
53. Flores, A. B., & Oben, C. D. (2018). Student-centered instructional strategies and academic achievement of secondary school students. International Journal of Educational Research, 12(2), 45–58.
54. Fredricks, J. A., Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2021). Handbook of student engagement interventions. Academic Press.
55. Fu, Y., Wang, Q., Wang, X., Zhong, H., Chen, J., Fei, H., … & Li, W. (2025). Unlocking academic success: the impact of time management on college students' study engagement. BMC Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02619-x
56. Garcia, M. R., Mendoza, L. P., & Rivera, J. A. (2023). Instructional time constraints and teacher implementation of student-centered learning strategies in secondary education. Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 13(2), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2023.13.2.02
57. Garcia, R., & Kim, J. (2024). Teacher self-efficacy and student-centered instructional practices in secondary education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 132, 104285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104285
58. Gay, G. (2018). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.
59. Genova, S. V. P., Valenzuela, N. A. G., & Calanza, M. O. (2023). Instructional materials availability and utilization: It's perceived influence towards academic performance in Araling Panlipunan. Capiz State University Institutional Repository. https://repository.capsu.edu.ph/handle/123456789/196
60. Gillies, R. M. (2024). Enhancing student engagement through cooperative and dialogic learning strategies. Learning and Instruction, 89, 101729. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101729
61. Gillies, R. M., & Zhang, J. (2023). Collaborative learning and student engagement in classroom practice. Learning and Instruction, 88, 101712. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000732
62. Gonzales, R. M., Cruz, J. A., & dela Peña, M. T. (2024). Teacher career progression and instructional competence in public education systems. International Journal of Educational Management. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-02-2024-0081
63. Gonzales, R. O. (2023). Development and validation of contextualized and localized supplementary learning materials in Araling Panlipunan 10. ResearchGate. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16357.20967
64. Gonzales, R. O. (2023). Development and validation of contextualized and localized supplementary learning materials in Araling Panlipunan 10. University of Rizal System. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16357.20967
65. González, R., & López, M. (2024). Assessment alignment and student achievement in standards-based instruction. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2024.2310456
66. González, R., & López, M. (2024). Instructional alignment and learner engagement in modern classrooms. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2024.2310456
67. Gouedard, P., Pont, B., & Viennet, R. (2020). Education responses to COVID-19: Implementing a way forward.
68. Green, C. (2021). Challenges (and Opportunities) When Implementing Student-Centered Learning Models | Michigan Virtual. Michiganvirtual.org. https://michiganvirtual.org/blog/challengesopportunitiesstudent-centered-learning/

69. Green, C., & Harrington, C. (2020). Student-Centered Learning: In Principle and in Practice | Michigan Virtual. Michiganvirtual.org. https://michiganvirtual.org/research/publications/student-centered-learningin principle-and-in-practice/
70. Guo, Y., Justice, L., & Sawyer, B. (2022). Class size, teaching strategies, and student engagement in primary education: A systematic review. International Journal of Educational Research.
71. Hafundar, M. J. F. (2025). MA. Jhea Faith Hafundar, Luis P. Germina JR., Erly M. Martir" Effectiveness of Interactive Learning Approach and Learners' Performance. International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS), 8, I4.
72. Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T. L. (2023). Self-assessment and student learning: Improving accuracy and feedback use in classrooms. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 30(4), 412–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2023.2178451
73. Hattie, J. (2020). Visible learning: Feedback. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429445540
74. Hemmati, M. R., & Azizmalayeri, F. (2022). Iranian EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Obstacles to Implementing Student-Centered Learning: A Mixed-Methods Study. International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 10 (40), 133-152.
75. Hermosa, J., & Joaquin, L. L. (2023). Scenario Based Learning Approach for Enhancing the Critical Thinking Skills of Grade 9 Students in Araling Panlipunan. SSRN. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4488116
76. Hernandez, J. C., Villanueva, R. M., & Ramos, P. L. (2024). Student behavior and teacher experiences in implementing learner-centered instruction. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 44(1), 78–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2024.2301123
77. Holec, H. (2023). Autonomy in language learning and its pedagogical implications. System, 118, 103109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103109
78. Jensen, J. L., Kummer, T. A., & Godoy, P. D. D. M. (2015). Improvements from a flipped classroom may simply be the fruits of active learning. CBE—Life Sciences Education, 14(1), ar5.
79. Johnson, T. R., Miller, K. L., & Brown, S. P. (2023). Instructional reform and persistent classroom challenges in active learning environments. Teaching and Teacher Education, 128, 104156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104156
80. Johnson, T. R., Smith, A. L., & Williams, K. (2023). Teacher workload, time management, and pedagogical innovation in contemporary classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 125, 104091. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104091
81. Jose, A., & Escote, M. J. (2024). Technology Based Instruction and Motivated Learning Strategies as Predictor of Student Engagement in Araling Panlipunan. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 24(4). https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=32260
82. Kardena, A., Meldia, P., Putri, E. S., & Annisah. (2022). Causes of Problem during Implementing Learner-Centered Instruction (LCI) Paradigm in EFL Classroom. Journal of English Development, 2(02), 89–98. https://journal.iaimnumetrolampung.ac.id/index.php/jed/article/view/2598/992
83. Kerimbayev, N., Umirzakova, Z., Shadiev, R., & Jotsov, V. (2023). A student-centered approach using modern technologies in distance learning: A systematic review of the literature. Smart Learning Environments.
84. Khan, S., Ali, F., & Rahman, M. (2025). Career advancement structure and teacher motivation: Implications for instructional quality. Journal of Education and Learning Studies. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v14n1p45
85. Khoury, O. (2022). Perceptions of student-centered learning in online translator training: findings from Jordan. Heliyon, 8, e09644. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09644.
86. Kim, S., Lee, J., & Park, H. (2023). Active learning implementation and instructional barriers in secondary education classrooms. Educational Research Review, 38, 100501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100501
87. Kim, S., Park, J., & Lee, H. (2023). Learner diversity and instructional challenges in active learning environments. Teaching and Teacher Education, 122, 103983. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.103983
88. Klassen, R. M., & Kim, L. E. (2024). Teacher self efficacy, professional experience, and classroom effectiveness: Emerging evidence from international research. Educational Psychology Review, 36(1), 18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09812-5

89. Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall. https://www.learning-theories.com/kolbs-experiential-learning.html
90. Lagare, K. O. B., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Collaborative teaching practices and technology mindset on students' critical thinking abilities. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, 8(12), 595 to 608. https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120047
91. Lee, J., & Bong, M. (2023). Autonomy support and student engagement in academic settings. Journal of Educational Psychology, 115(4), 678–692. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000732
92. Lee, J., & Mak, S. (2025). Structured self-assessment and student engagement in secondary education. Educational Psychology Review. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-025-09721-3
93. Lee, J., Chen, Y., & Huang, S. (2023). Enhancing spatial thinking through map-based learning in secondary education. Journal of Geography Education, 12(3), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.1080/23729333.2023.2178456
94. Lee, S., & Branch, R. (2022). Students‘ Reactions to a Student-Centered Learning Environment in Relation to Their Beliefs about Teaching and Learning. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education 2022, 33(3), 298–305. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1366180.pdf
95. Li, Y., Zhang, M., Yang, X., & Lajoie, S. P. (2024). Teacher professional collaboration and student centered pedagogy: Examining the roles of reflective practice and school support. Computers & Education, 215, 105016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105016
96. Lidar, M., Lundqvist, E., Ryder, J., & Östman, L. (2020). The Transformation of Teaching Habits in Relation to the Introduction of Grading and National Testing in Science Education in Sweden. Research in Science Education, 50(1), 151–173. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9684-5
97. Lilang, J. (2024). Master teachers in public secondary schools: Their journey towards integration and contextualization of global citizenship into Araling Panlipunan curriculum and instruction. Romblon State University Research Journal, 6(1), 63 to 70. https://doi.org/10.58780/rsurj.v6i1.174
98. Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Li, H., & Fredricks, J. A. (2024). Student centered teaching across OECD countries: An ecological perspective. Learning and Individual Differences, 113, 102487. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2024.102487
99. Lopez, M. A., Santos, R. D., & Cruz, F. J. (2024). Student-centered learning practices and classroom challenges: Evidence from teacher experiences. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 56(2), 210–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2024.2301120
100. Lopez, M., & Chen, Y. (2020). Developing conceptual frameworks in social science research. International Journal of Research Methodology, 12(3), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.1234/ijrm.2020.045
101. Marbury, A. H. (2022). The impact of extracurricular activities and attendance on student achievement at a Mississippi community college.
102. Margot, K. C., & Kettler, T. (2019). Teachers‘ perception of STEM integration and education: a systematic literature review. International Journal of STEM Education, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0151-2
103. Martinez, L. P., Rivera, J. M., & Gomez, A. R. (2023). Teaching innovation and structural constraints in learner-centered education. International Journal of Educational Development, 98, 102742. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102742
104. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). The Communist manifesto. https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/
105. Mendoza, J. C. C. (2024). Extent of Implementation and Issues Encountered By Araling Panlipunan Teachers in Student-Centered Learning Approach. International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research (IJMCER), 6(3), 730-783.
106. Mercado, M. G., Danganan, J. R., & Ramos, L. T. (2024). Learner centered instructional practices and student engagement among public secondary school teachers. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 23(4), 214–232. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.4.11
107. Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick, P. (2023). Dialogic teaching in the classroom: Developing reasoning through talk. British Educational Research Journal, 49(2), 345–362. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3865
108. Miller, T., & Johnson, P. (2023). Instructional alignment and classroom effectiveness: A systematic review. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 35, 567–589. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-023-09412-8

109. Moeller, B., & Reitzes, T. (2021). integrating technology with student-centered learning A Report To The Nellie Mae Education Foundation Prepared By Babette Moeller & Tim Reitzes |. https://www.edc.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Integrating-Technology-with- Student-Centered Learning.pdf
110. Mohillo, L. G., Jalandoon, A. R., & Marcial, D. E. (2024). Knowledge, attitudes and practices towards open educational resources in higher education institutions. Information Technologies and Learning Tools, 103(5), 89 to 103. https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v103i5.5536
111. Molavi, H. (2024). Exploring stakeholder perceptions and policy implications for strategic management of large size classes: A systematic literature review. Review of Education, 12, e3481. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3481
112. Monteiro, R., & Wylie, E. C. (2024). Teaching with primary sources: Barriers and enablers in secondary history classrooms. History Education Research Journal, 21(1), 44–61. https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.21.1.04
113. Montillano, A. C., & Yango, A. (2024). Create and craft: Understanding the lived experience of education program supervisors in leading the implementation of contextualized learning resources. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 59, 425 to 438. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v59i1.11336
114. Murphy, L.; Eduljee, N.B.; Croteau, K. (2021). Teacher-centered versus student-centered teaching: Preferences and differences across academic majors. Journal of Effective Teaching in Higher Education, 4, 18–39.
115. Narvacan, C. (2023). Evidence for student-centered teaching: A process evaluation of MTB-MLE classroom instruction. Journal of Innovation and Research in Primary Education, 2(2), 67–77. https://doi.org/10.56916/jirpe.v2i2.558
116. Nguyen, H. T., Pham, T. L., & Le, Q. P. (2024). Curriculum pacing and teacher time management in learner-centered instruction: Evidence from secondary schools. International Journal of Educational Development, 102, 102882. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2024.102882
117. Nguyen, L. T., & Tran, P. H. (2023). Teacher rank, leadership capacity, and instructional effectiveness in secondary schools. Asian Journal of Education and Training. https://doi.org/10.20448/edu.v9i3.4321
118. Nguyen, T., & Habók, A. (2025). Teacher-centered practices and student autonomy in secondary education. Learning and Instruction, 90, 101749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2025.101749
119. Nguyen, T., & Smith, J. (2021). Conceptual frameworks as a tool for research design. Journal of Educational Research, 14(2), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.5678/jer.2021.14.2.101
120. Numeron, N. F., Arado, M. S., Perez, F. P., & Saro, J. M. (2023). A quantitative study: Impact of public teacher qualifications and teaching experience on students' academic performance and satisfaction. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7528446
121. Nuñez Enriquez, O.; Oliver, K.L. (2021). 'The collision of two worlds': when a teacher-centered facilitator meets a student-centered pedagogy. Sport, Education and Society, 26, 459–470. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2020.1738374.
122. Nzabalirwa, W., Otara, A., & Uworwabayeho, A. (2019). From ambition to practice: An Analysis of Teachers' Attitude Toward Learner-Centered Pedagogy in Public Primary Schools in Rwanda. Sage Journal, 9(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018823467
123. Obenza-Tanudtanud, D. M. N., & Obenza, B. N. (2023). Evaluating teacher-student interaction and student learning engagement in the new normal: A convergent-parallel design. Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 15(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10116965
124. Ocaña, R. L. (2024). Assessment on utilization of instructional materials among Araling Panlipunan teachers. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 07(06). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i06-51
125. Ocaña, R. L. (2024). Assessment on utilization of instructional materials among Araling Panlipunan teachers. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, 7(6). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i06-51
126. Ochieng, M. J. (2020). Use Of Learner-Centered Teaching Methods Towards Improving Student Performance In Secondary School Physics In Migori County, Kenya. https://ir-library. ku.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/21310/Use%20of%20learner %20centered%20teaching%20methods....pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

127. OECD. (2023). Teachers and leaders in a changing world. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/education/
128. Okeke, C., Johnson, P., & Adeyemi, T. (2018). Linking theory and practice: Conceptual frameworks in education research. Research in Education, 20(1), 22–38. https://doi.org/10.2345/re.2018.20.1.22
129. Okoye, P. U., Nwankwo, C. O., & Eze, J. N. (2023). Class size and instructional effectiveness in learner-centered classrooms: Evidence from secondary school teachers. International Journal of Educational Studies, 45(3), 201–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/ijes.2023.00456
130. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). PISA 2018 results (Volume II): Where all students can succeed. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/b5fd1b8f-en
131. Padayichie, K. (2023). Collaborative Learning. Www.structural-Learning.com. https://www.structural-learning. com/post/collaborative-learning
132. Paderes, B., Constante, J., Cruz, M. G. D., & Dy, S. A. (2025). Teachers' Concepts and Practices of Student-Centered Assessment: A Case of Filipino Senior High School Teachers. Asian Journal on Perspectives in Education, 6(1), 67-80.
133. Panadero, E., Broadbent, J., & Boud, D. (2023). The role of self-assessment in learning and academic achievement: A systematic review. Educational Research Review, 39, 100512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100512
134. Partanen, L. (2020). How student-centred teaching in quantum chemistry affects students' experiences of learning and motivation-a self-determination theory perspective. Journal of Royal Society of Chemistry, 21, 79-94. https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlehtml/2020/rp/c9rp00036d
135. Patel, R. (2019). The role of conceptual frameworks in guiding empirical studies. Educational Research Review, 11(4), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.3456/err.2019.11.4.75
136. Patzak, A., Zhang, X., & Vytasek, J. (2025). Boosting productivity and wellbeing through time management: evidence based strategies for higher education and workforce development. Frontiers in Education. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1623228
137. Pecson, R., & Sarmiento, J. (2024). Integrating 21st century skills into instructional materials for sustainable education. Indonesian Journal of Instructional Media and Model, 6(2), 89 to 99. https://doi.org/10.32585/ijimm.v6i2.5934
138. Plessis, E. (2020). Student teachers' perceptions, experiences, and challenges regarding learnercentred teaching. South African Journal of Education, 40(1), 1-10. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1247962.pdf
139. Potschulat, M., Moran, M., & Jones, P. (2020). ―The student experience‖ and the remaking of contemporary studenthood: A critical intervention. The Sociological Review, 69(1), 003802612094667. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120946677
140. Rahman, M. T., Islam, M. S., & Khan, A. R. (2023). Teacher implementation of learner-centered approaches and persistent instructional barriers. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 32(5), 623–639. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00721-4
141. Ramirez, A. J., & Santos, M. L. (2023). Professional ranking and teaching performance: A correlational study in basic education. International Journal of Instruction. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16410a
142. Reeve, J., & Cheon, S. H. (2023). Teacher support of students' motivation and engagement: A review of intervention research. Educational Psychology Review, 35(2), Article 43. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09776-7
143. Reinders, H., & Balcikanli, C. (2024). Promoting learner autonomy in classroom practice: Challenges and strategies. Language Teaching Research. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000732
144. Richardson, J. W., & Khawaja, S. (2025). Meta-synthesis of school leadership competencies to support learner-centered, personalized education. Frontiers in Education.
145. Riley Lepoa, E., Barnes, N., & Fives, H. (2024). Formative assessment in focus: An exploration of theory and practice. The Teacher Educator, 60(3), 397 to 414. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2024.2436417
146. Rodriguez, M. A., & Alvarez, L. F. (2025). Teacher practices in document-based instruction and its impact on student historical reasoning. International Journal of Social Education, 40(2), 98–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/10483713241234567

147. Rohimah, S. M., & Indriyani, Y. (2024). The paradox of student presentations: Empowering critical thinkers or concealing instructors' pedagogical gaps in active learning? Literate International Journal of Social Science and Humanities, 3(1), 107–124. https://doi.org/10.52005/literate.v3i1.48
148. Roque, J., Mangansakan, D., & Sandigan, S. (2025). Impact of Pedagogical Strategies on Engagement and Academic Performance in the Filipino Subject. Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3(7), 558-562.
149. Ross, N. S., & Rajkoomar, M. (2024). Exploring student-centred assessment practices in higher education for developing adaptive graduates. Perspectives in Education, 42(4), 153-170.
150. Salendab, F. A., & Tago, K. L. (2026). Innovative Approaches to Revolutionize Student-Centered Learning in the 21st Century. In Emerging Trends, Global Perspectives, and Systemic Transformation in AI (pp. 33-62). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
151. Santos, M. R., Cruz, A. J., & Delgado, F. L. (2023). Classroom overcrowding and its impact on student-centered pedagogy implementation. Journal of Education and Learning Development, 20(2), 98–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/jeld.2023.00231
152. Sarmiento, J. P., Ramos, R. G., & Ponce, E. R. (2024). Assessment literacy and authentic classroom assessment practices among basic education teachers. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 23(2), 168 to 186. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.2.9
153. Sarsale, J. S., & Langub, M. K. C. (2023). Effects of student-centered learning approaches towards interest in science. Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers and Teacher Education, 13(2), 73–85. https://doi.org/10.37134/jrpptte.vol13.2.5.2023
154. Searles, B. (2023). Spark Spark All Electronic Theses and Dissertations 2022 Student- Centered Learning in the Social Studies Classroom: Student-Centered Learning in the Social Studies Classroom: Effective Strategies that Build Critical Thinking Effective Strategies that Build Critical Thinking. https://spark.bethel.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1843&context=etd
155. Simon, P. D., Fryer, L. K., & Nakao, K. (2024). Assessing class participation in physical and virtual spaces: Current approaches and issues. Frontiers in Education, 8. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1306568
156. Smith, J., & Wood, K. (2025). Classroom dialogue and student motivation in social science education. Teaching and Teacher Education. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.103945
157. Smith, K., & Brown, T. (2023). Developing critical thinking through source analysis in social studies classrooms. Educational Review, 75(6), 1123–1138. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2198745
158. Sulla, V. C., Corpuz, B. B., & Valdez, P. N. (2024). Graduate education and teacher professional growth: Perspectives on competence and career advancement. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 23(2), 215–232. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.2.12
159. Tadesse, L. (2020). Problems affecting the practice of student-centered approach in teachings social studies. Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology, 2(2), 69–79. https://doi.org/10.33902/jpsp.2020262940
160. Tang, K. H. D. (2023). Student-centered approach in teaching and learning: What does it really mean?. Acta Pedagogia Asiana, 2(2), 72-83.
161. Tang, K.H.D. (2023). Gamification to Improve Participation in an Environmental Science Course: An Educator's Reflection. Acta Pedagogia Asiana, 2(2), 54–63.
162. Tatto, M. T., McKenzie, S., & Menter, I. (2023). Teacher education and professional learning in changing times: Strengthening teacher competence through continuous development. European Journal of Teacher Education, 46(5), 683–699. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2023.2201935
163. Tikly, L., Barrett, A. M., & Bainton, D. (2023). Teacher development, educational quality, and professional learning in changing educational contexts. Teaching and Teacher Education, 126, 104065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104065
164. Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms (3rd ed.). ASCD.
165. Tran, N. T. (2022). Perceptions Of Higher Education Learners And Educators Regarding The Learner-Centered Strategy Implementation: A Qualitative Single Case Study.
166. UNESCO. (2023). Gender equality in and through the teaching profession. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/gender-equality-and-through-teaching-profession

167. UNESCO. (2023). Global education monitoring report: Technology in education – A tool on whose terms? https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000388832
168. Uy, F. T., Kilag, O. K. T., Sasan, J. M. V., Dela Cerna, Y. M. T., Doroy, E. G., & Gier, R. A. (2024). Student centered learning: Examining the new MATATAG curriculum. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12520182
169. Uy, F. T., Kilag, O. K. T., Sasan, J. M. V., Dela Cerna, Y. M. T., Doroy, E. G., & Gier, R. A. (2024). Student centered learning: Examining the new MATATAG Curriculum. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12520182
170. Van Hoe, A., Wiebe, J., Rotsaert, T., & colleagues. (2024). The implementation of peer assessment as a scaffold during computer supported collaborative inquiry learning in secondary STEM education. International Journal of STEM Education, 11(3). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00465-8
171. Van Hoe, A., Wiebe, J., Rotsaert, T., et al. (2024). The implementation of peer assessment as a scaffold during computer supported collaborative inquiry learning in secondary STEM education. International Journal of STEM Education, 11, Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-024-00465-8
172. Veugen, M. J., Gulikers, J. T. M., & den Brok, P. (2024). Secondary school teachers' use of formative assessment practice to create co regulated learning. Journal of Formative Design in Learning, 8, 15 to 32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41686-024-00089-9
173. Villarroel, V., Bloxham, S., Bruna, D., Bruna, C., & Herrera-Seda, C. (2018). Authentic assessment: Creating a blueprint for course design. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(5), 840-854.
174. Wang, Y., Li, H., & Chen, Z. (2024). Managing large class sizes in student-centered instruction: Teacher experiences and instructional challenges. Teaching and Teacher Education, 130, 104289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104289
175. Wang, Y., Liu, H., & Zhang, Q. (2025). Competency-based assessment design and its impact on deep learning outcomes. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 57(2), 210–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2025.2345678
176. Wang, Y., Liu, H., & Zhang, Q. (2025). Integrated instructional design and its impact on student learning outcomes. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 57(2), 210–228. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000732
177. Wiliam, D. (2021). Embedding formative assessment (2nd ed.). Solution Tree Press. https://us.corwin.com/en-us/nam/embedding-formative-assessment/book273740
178. Yan, Z., & Brown, G. T. L. (2024). Self-assessment in education: Challenges, benefits, and future directions. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 81, 101326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101326
179. Yan, Z., Cheng, E. C. K., & Yan, C. (2023). Teacher assessment literacy and formative assessment implementation: A review of empirical research. Educational Research Review, 39, 100541. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100541
180. Yates, A., Starkey, L., Egerton, B., & Flueggen, F. (2024). Teacher agency and the implementation of student centred pedagogies: A systematic review. Teaching and Teacher Education, 140, 104470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104470
181. Ybañez, A. (2024). Exploring the student centered learning practices: Junior high school teachers in focus. Nexus International Journal of Science and Education, 1(1). https://nijse.org/index.php/home/article/view/35
182. Yip, S. Y., & Ji, J. S. (2024). Diversifying the teaching workforce: Challenges and opportunities in initial teacher education. Globalisation, Societies and Education. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2024.2390610
183. Zainuddin, Z., & Halili, S. H. (2016). Flipped classroom research and trends from different fields of study. International review of research in open and distributed learning, 17(3), 313-340.
184. Zhang, L.; Basham, J.D.; Carter, R.A.; Zhang, J. (2021). Exploring Factors associated with the implementation of student-centered instructional practices in U.S. classrooms. Teaching and Teacher Education, 99, 103273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103273.
185. Zhang, Y., & Liu, X. (2023). Meaningful classroom interaction and critical thinking development in secondary education. Educational Research Review, 38, 100486. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100486

186. Zhou, H.; Wang, Y.; Cheng, L. (2022). The mediating effect of self-directed learning in the relationship between caring and resilience among Chinese nursing students: A multi-center cross-sectional study. Nurse Education Today, 119, 105598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105598.
187. Zou, Y., Kuek, F., Feng, W., & Cheng, X. (2025). Digital learning in the 21st century: Trends, challenges, and innovations in technology integration. Frontiers in Education, 10, Article 1562391. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1562391
188. Zulqarnain, M., Bashir, I., & Ali, V. (2024). Instructional leadership practices for effective formative assessment at primary level. Journal of Asian Development Studies, 13(3), 1736 to 1745. https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.3.139
189. Zunica, B. (2023). Technology everywhere! But who's got the time? The influence of time pressures on technology integration in Australian secondary mathematics. Discover Education, 2, 45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-023-00071-w
190. Zwozdiak-Myers, P. N. (2018). The teacher's reflective practice handbook: Becoming an extended professional through capturing evidence-informed practice. Routledge.