EVALUATING THE BLENDED TEACHING READINESS OF TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STUDENT-CENTERED LEARNING: A CONVERGENT DESIGN

ALFREDO JR. P. MAGBANUA

ABSTRACT

Student-centered learning in a blended teaching environment has been challenging, especially with the sudden shift. Thus, this study aimed to evaluate the blended teaching readiness of the participants concerning the implementation of student-centered learning conceptualized using the pragmatic lens. Specifically, the convergent design mixed-methods approach of purposively chosen public elementary schools in Region XII teachers served as respondents for the quantitative and qualitative phase. Further, validated and reliability-tested adapted survey questionnaires and guide questions were used in the study. Statistical tools like mean, standard deviation, and regression analysis were used to analyze the quantitative data, while thematic analysis was applied in the qualitative phase. Findings revealed that the status of blended teaching readiness of teachers was high, which means that blended teaching readiness of teachers is often manifested in public elementary schools. On the other hand, the extent of student-centered implementation was very high, which means that student-centered learning is always evident in public elementary schools. Meanwhile, it was found out that blended teaching readiness influences the extent of implementation of student-centered learning. In the qualitative phase, eight essential themes emerged about the participants' views, such as emphasizing deep learning and understanding of students, using the most appropriate instructional strategies to support the learning objectives, coaching learners and allowing participation in key decisions of their learning experience, collaborative/ supportive environment emphasizing on feedback and capacity building, non-conducive learning environment, balancing demands of teaching, managing classroom-related issues, and diversifying instructional methods. Likewise, five essential themes emerged from in-depth interviews of the teacher participants on the role of their experiences in shaping their beliefs and commitment, namely, individualizing student learning experiences, shifting emphasis from teaching to learning, engaging in inquiry-based learning, obtaining a positive mindset, and making right decisions. Finally, the nature of data integration revealed merging-converging.

Keywords: Education, educational leadership, blended teaching readiness, student-centered learning, convergent design, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The implementation of student-centered learning has become a primary concern in the education system due to the global health crisis caused by the covid-19 pandemic (Dhawan, 2020). For this reason, immediate needs of sharing learning content with students, delivering lectures, and providing access to learning materials became the top priorities in running new modalities of learning (Riggs, 2020). Hence, these changes scream for an immense evaluation of teachers' blended readiness to transform the educational landscape to address the constraints brought by covid-19 and ensure that learning of school children continues in this new normal setting (Campbell, 2020).

Today, the government addresses these educational challenges by strictly prohibiting face-to-face classes this school year due to the COVID-19 situation in the country. Thus, the Department of Education (DepEd) is implementing a blended teaching approach to ensure that the education of millions of Filipino learners will continue (CNN, 2020). However, the abrupt shift of the public elementary schools to blended teaching posed a challenge to implementing student-centered learning. Among the possible challenges that teachers may encounter are the vertical and high-ceilinged learning curve and increased cognitive load. Teachers may over-deliver the content and activities with their inability to facilitate the learners in the instructional process directly; this, in turn, will lead to poorer learning outcomes, thus, failure to implement student-centered learning (Uy, 2020).

In France, Italy, and Germany, a study conducted by Di Pietro et al. (2020) about the impact of covid-19 on education results revealed that the abrupt switch from offline to online learning has adverse effects on children. Students suffer a weekly learning loss of between 0.82 and 2.3% because of less time spent in learning than the amount of time they typically invest in a school where a student-centered learning approach is evident. Moreover, an article published by CNN (2020) said cognitive skills might be enriched through online classes, but it would only leave the class to be teacher-centered, which explains why some parents call for —academic freeze. In Ethiopia, Kumar (2016) studied different problems while implementing the student-centered method results revealed that the challenges were lack of students‘ interest and confidence where students feel discomfort when they work with others. Furthermore, Atweh (2017) describes that change in any curriculum would not be effective if somebody in the implementation aspect is not getting away from its traditional restrictions. He mentioned the need for synergy among curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment to implement student-centered learning.

It is said that creating a student-centered learning experience is challenging when we‘re not physically present in the classroom. Despite that, student- centered learning in blended teaching delivery has been adopted worldwide (Barbour, 2011). In Asia, blended teaching is also widely adopted in Korea, Singapore, Japan, and China; however, most minor implementation in ASEAN countries like Myanmar, Cambodia, Malaysia, Brunei, Laos, and the Philippines. It is said that blended teaching in these countries is still constrained due to infrastructural and policy challenges (Tham et al., 2011).

In the Philippines, the schools implement various alternative learning delivery modalities, including printed or offline modular learning, online learning, and television or radio-based instruction. Based on the survey, 8.8 million parents chose printed modules, followed by blended learning with 3.9 million parents, online learning with 3.8 million, TV and radio-based instruction 2.3 million parents (Magsambol, 2020). In this mode of delivery, teachers are task to prepare educational mechanisms that are better suited to promote student- centered learning under blended teaching delivery. Also, teachers are being trained on utilizing newer platforms and innovative tools in a short period. Consequently, DepEd faces issues on the quality and appropriateness of modules and video lessons circulated on social media. It indicates that DepEd is not yet ready to shift to blended teaching (Uy, 2020) abruptly.

Likewise, a research conducted by Reyes et al. (2020), among 3,670 medical students, only 1,505 students, or 41%, considered themselves physically and mentally capable of engaging in the new learning environment in the Philippines. Thus, it suggests implementing student-centered interventions in the curriculum as educational institutions play a significant role in addressing these educational challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond.

In DepEd Region XII, most students prefer to use modules as a mode of learning followed by online learning in sustaining student-centered learning in a blended teaching environment. In South Cotabato Division, 85% of the students in the province prefer modules as a mode of learning. The remaining 15% of the school children in the province have the necessary resources for online or internet-based learning schemes. On this approach, students will become autonomous and independent (Doguiles, 2020).

Despite the numerous research studies on assessing the readiness of teachers on blended learning transition amid the COVID-19 crisis (Anoba & Cahapay, 2020; Hasan & Mustafa, 2015), there are not many studies conducted about the issues related to student-centered learning and blended teaching in the abrupt shift in the public elementary schools that explains the challenges that hinder its implementation in schools especially in SOCCSKSARGEN Region where the size and dynamics across schools are highly varying. More so, most research related to student-centered learning and blended teaching readiness focuses on higher education, but this time the researcher will focus on primary education. Likewise, few studies like that of Rivera (2017) and Ventayin et al. (2020) have ventured into evaluating the implementation of student-centered learning in a blended teaching environment.

More so, the findings of the studies mentioned above were conducted either qualitative or quantitative. Thus, this suggests a gap of knowledge that prompted the researcher and motivated him to conduct the study that deals with evaluating the blended teaching readiness of teachers about the implementation of student- centered learning using a mixed-methods approach, specifically convergent design.

This study is relevant as it will generate meaningful information that will serve as the basis for the school administrators and policymakers in designing faculty development programs. It will identify areas for improvement in the implementation of student-centered learning under a blended teaching approach. Furthermore, this study could be an added literature regarding student-centered learning and blended teaching. Finally, this study will be presented to teachers during their School Learning Action Cell (SLAC) sessions and School leaders, District and Division Supervisors during their seminars, training, and meetings. Likewise, in various national or international research congresses and online reference journal publication for a broader scope of dissemination.

FRAMEWORK

This study was anchored on Constructivism Learning Theory. This theory is widely used to examine the instructional readiness of teachers for blended teaching and the implementation of student-centered learning. Student-centered learning is a constructivist theory where students learn best when they can learn from each other. The theory states that blended teaching is interconnected and dynamically moving, significantly influencing student-centered learning in education. In particular, the proponents of constructivism learning theory state that knowledge is not a fixed and defined body of facts and concepts but constantly changing and dynamically constructed by the learner himself/herself in interaction with others and the learning environment (Mclaughlin et al., 2015).

METHOD

Research Design

This study employed the mixed methods approach, specifically the convergent design. A mixed-method approach is a research technique that promotes the systematic synthesis or —mixingll of quantitative and qualitative data within a single study or ongoing investigation (Creswell, 2013). Thus, this method collects and analyzes quantitative and qualitative data and integrates data during data collection, analysis, and discussion.

In the quantitative phase, the researcher has used a descriptive correlation approach to address the problems in the study and achieve its purpose. This approach measures two or more relevant variables and assesses a relationship between them (Schmitz, 2012). Survey questionnaires on the implementation of student-centered learning and blended teaching readiness of teachers were collected at the same phase with a five-point Likert scale. Moreover, in this study, the relationship between the blended teaching readiness of teachers and their extent of implementation of student-centered learning was described and correlated.

Furthermore, the descriptive approach was designed to depict the participants in an accurate way. More simply putting descriptive approach is all about describing people who take part in the study. It does not answer questions about how, when, why the characteristics occurred. Rather it also addresses the question. The characteristics used to describe the situation or population were usually categorical schemes, also known as descriptive categories.

Respondents

The study participants were the 250 public elementary school teachers in the selected public elementary schools in Region XII who are blended learning implementers. This research employed purposive sampling in selecting respondents of the study. Parreno et al. (2014) defined purposive sampling as the process of choosing the respondents of the study based on their knowledge of the information required by the researcher. Likewise, the purposive sampling technique allows the researcher to decide what needs to be known. With this, the researcher set out to find people who could and are willing to provide the information by knowledge or experience (Lewis et al., 2006). Further, purposive sampling was used in selecting participants to achieve a homogeneous sample whose units share the same characteristics or traits (Creswell, 2017).

Instruments

In gathering the quantitative data, the researcher used two adapted survey questionnaires. The objective of questionnaires was to elicit information on the implementation of student-centered learning under a blended teaching delivery in public elementary schools.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts: Part I had six items comprised of the respondent's demographical data. It consists of the respondent‘s age, gender, academic qualification, years in service, subject, and grade level taught. Part II focused on the blended teaching readiness of teachers. It consists of five indicators: foundational knowledge, skills, disposition, instructional planning, instructional methods and strategies, assessment and evaluation, and management. The Blended Teaching Readiness Questionnaire is adapted from Graham et al. (2019), which underwent modification and content validity. Additionally, this instrument has an average value of 0.983 for internal consistency which means it was a good and reliable tool. This tool consists of 65 important questions to evaluate the blended teaching readiness of public elementary school teachers.

In the manner of answering the online survey questionnaire, it was scored and quantified using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5– Always, 4– Oftentimes, 3–Sometimes, 2–Seldom, and 1–Never.

Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were used in analyzing the quantitative data: mean, standard deviation, and regression analysis. Mean was used to determine the extent of the implementation of student-centered learning and blended teaching readiness of teachers. The standard deviation was used to measure the spread of the data distribution and determine how varied the participants' responses are. Moreover, regression analysis was used to determine if blended teaching readiness significantly influenced the implementation of student- centered learning.

While in the qualitative phase, the notes obtained from IDI were analyzed using thematic analysis, which was employed to determine the emerging codes and themes. According to Braun et al. (2006), thematic analysis is one of the most common qualitative research forms. It emphasizes pinpointing, examining, and recording patterns or themes within data. These themes were patterned across data sets that are important to describe a phenomenon and are associated with a specific research question raised in the study (Boyatzis, 1998).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Quantitative Phase

Table 1 presents the computed mean scores on the status of blended teaching readiness of teachers in the public elementary schools in Region XII. The status of blended teaching readiness of teachers contains five indicators, namely, foundational knowledge, skills, and dispositions, instructional planning, instructional methods and strategies, assessment and evaluation, and management. It can be seen from the table that the overall mean for the status of blended teaching readiness of teachers is 3.92, which can be described as high. The cited overall mean score was obtained based on the mean scores of 3.93 for foundational knowledge, skills, and dispositions, 3.92 for instructional planning, 3.92 for instructional methods and strategies, 3.94 for assessment and evaluation, and 3.90 for management.

Table 1
Status of Blended Teaching Readiness of Teachers

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
A. Foundational Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions			
1. Technical Literacy			
1.1 Mastering new online technologies on my own.	3.96	.64	High
1.2 Troubleshooting unfamiliar technological issues that I and my students encounter.	3.78	.71	High
1.3 Using the tools commonly found in a learning management system such as grade book, announcements, content pages, quizzes, discussion boards.	3.88	.64	High
1.4 Using content-specific educational software outside of the learning management system such as math/literacy/science educational software, educational games.	3.80	.70	High
1.5 Finding quality online content resources relevant to my student learning needs such as media resources, lesson plans, and others.	3.98	.68	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.88**	**.53**	**High**
2. Digital Citizenship			
2.1 Modeling the legal use of instructional materials that includes copyright, fair use, creative commons.	3.88	.69	High
2.2 Ensuring student online privacy regarding technology use agreements for sharing student data, protection of online data and identities.	3.91	.74	High
2.3 Modeling online safety for my students regarding how to ensure password protection, protect against cyberbullying, detect scams, and use content filters and virus software, and others.	3.89	.76	High

Continuation of Table 1

B. Instructional Planning			
1. Planning Blended Activities			
1.1 Creating activities that combine online and offline components to help my students develop important life skills such as creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration.	3.97	.74	High
1.2 Sequencing activities in the learning management system in an easy-to-follow format.	3.99	.66	High
1.3 Combining online and offline activities that enable student ownership of their learning (e.g., flexibility in when, where and how they learn).	3.94	.71	High
1.4 Incorporating existing online and offline educational materials into learning activities.	3.92	.68	High
1.5 Creating new online and offline learning materials when relevant content is not available.	3.90	.69	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.94**	**.60**	**High**
2. Planning Blended Assessment			
2.1 Creating performance-based assessments that require my students to use technology in ways that demonstrate important life skills such as creativity, critical thinking, communication, collaboration.	3.89	.70	High
2.2 Creating formative assessments to measure students' learning progress such as polls, and online surveys.	3.82	.82	High
2.3 Incorporating appropriate media into assessments like video, audio, images).	3.90	.76	High
2.4 Determining when to use computer-administered vs paper-based assessments.	3.90	.75	High
2.5 Creating an approach to assessment that allows for student choice in how they demonstrate mastery of learning objectives.	3.97	.62	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.90**	**.63**	**High**
Category Mean	**3.92**	**.58**	**High**
C. Instructional Methods and Strategies			
1. Personalizing Instruction			
1.1. Using data collected online and offline to customize students' learning experience.	3.93	.76	High
1.2. Using data collected online and offline to determine which groups or individual students need additional instructional support.	3.90	.75	High
1.3. Answering students' online and offline course related questions.	3.85	.73	High
1.4. Using student performance data to provide timely help with misconceptions.	3.91	.72	High
1.5. Addressing any limitations of educational software through individual or small group instruction.	3.81	.73	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.88**	**.62**	**High**
2. Facilitating Student-Student Interaction			
2.1. Facilitating students' small group discussions online and offline.	3.85	.80	High
2.2. Facilitating online and offline small group collaboration on projects of my students.	3.81	.78	High
2.3. Strengthening students' sense of belonging to the classroom community using online and offline communication.	3.93	.76	High
2.4. Monitoring students' online and offline interactions with each other to ensure quality participation.	3.98	.74	High
2.5. Creating opportunities for my students to teach each other inside and outside of class using online technology.	3.82	.86	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.88**	**.68**	**High**

Continuation of Table 1

3. Facilitating Teacher-Student Interaction			
3.1. Determining when it is most effective to interact with my students online versus offline.	3.91	.71	High
3.2. Strengthening caring relationships with my students via online and offline communication.	3.98	.69	High
3.3. Conveying my personality in online text-based communication with my students.	3.90	.73	High
3.4. Ensuring that my students are comfortable communicating with me online and offline.	4.06	.72	High
3.5. Responding promptly to online and offline student inquiries.	4.08	.74	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.99**	**.60**	**High**
4. Facilitating Student-Content Interaction			
4.1. Ensuring that my students can navigate online and offline educational materials.	3.98	.68	High
4.2. Using the learning management system to monitor students' activities with online and offline educational materials to determine if they are on-task.	3.92	.68	High
4.3. Using data to monitor students' progress in subject-specific software programs.	3.96	.71	High
4.4. Helping my students to select online and offline materials that are relevant to them.	3.93	.75	High
4.5. Encouraging students' persistence with independent online and offline learning activities.	3.92	.71	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.94**	**.61**	**High**
Category Mean	**3.92**	**.56**	**High**
D. Assessment and Evaluation			
1. Implementing Blended Assessment			
1.1 Administering online and offline performance-based assessments.	3.95	.77	High
1.2 Using online and offline tools to provide my students with opportunities for reflective self-assessment.	3.94	.68	High
1.3 Using online and traditional grading rubrics to clearly identify individual student performance gaps.	3.91	.75	High
1.4 Using data from online and offline assessments to identify patterns in group and whole class learning gaps.	3.90	.73	High
1.5 Helping my students use online and offline assessment data to guide their own learning progress.	3.93	.74	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.93**	**.64**	**High**
2 Evaluating and Reflecting			
2.1 Using students' performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers' online and offline instruction.	3.98	.66	High
2.2 Using students' performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of online and offline educational materials and assessments.	3.96	.68	High
2.3 Using my student performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of how online and offline activities and assessments were blended together.	3.94	.71	High
2.4 Providing my students with multiple opportunities to provide input about the effectiveness of the online and offline teaching strategies.	3.91	.74	High
2.5 Collaborating with other teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of units that blend online and offline instruction.	3.96	.67	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.95**	**.60**	**High**
Category Mean	**3.94**	**.59**	**High**

Foundational Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions. This category consists of three sub-categories, namely, technical literacy, digital citizenship,and dispositions. In terms of technical literacy, the sub-category mean is 3.88, which can be described as high. Notably, their responses show that the items areranging from 3.82 to 3.98. The item with the mean score of 3.98 stated *finding quality online content resources relevant to my student learning needs, such as media resources, lesson plans, and others* with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.78, stated *troubleshooting unfamiliar technological issues that I and my students encounter* with a high description.

For digital citizenship, teachers endorse a high sub-category mean score of 3.91. Further, it is shown that the means of the items in this category are ranging from 3.88 to 3.99. The item that has the mean score of 3.99 stated ensuring access to online learning activities for all students, including students who are in low socioeconomic status, the English language learners, the special education, gifted, and others with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.88 stated modeling the legal use of instructional materials that includes copyright, fair use, creative commons with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these three sub-categories under foundational knowledge, skills, and dispositions generates a high category mean of 3.93. Notably, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.78 to 4.16. The item with a mean score of 4.16 with a high description is exploring new teaching strategies that blend offline and online learning. On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 3.78 is troubleshooting unfamiliar technological issues that I and my students encounter with a high description.

Instructional Planning. This category consists of two sub-categories, namely, planning blended activities and planning blended assessment. About planning blended activities, the sub-category mean is 3.94, which can be described as high. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.90 to 3.97. The item with a mean score of 3.97 stated creating activities that combine online and offline components to help my students develop important life skills such as creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.90, creating new online and offline learning materials when relevant content is not available with a high description.
In terms of planning blended assessment, the sub-category mean is 3.90, which can be described as high. In particular, mean scores ranged from 3.82 to 3.97.The item with a mean score of 3.97 stated creating an approach to assessment that allows for student choice in demonstrating mastery of learning objectives with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.82 stated creating formative assessments to measure students' learning progress, such as polls and online surveys with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these two sub-categories under instructional planning generates a high category mean of 3.92. Specifically, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.82 to 3.99. The item with a mean score of
3.99 with a description of high is sequencing activities in the learning management system in an easy-to-follow format. On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 3.82 is creating formative assessments to measure students' learning progress, such as polls and online surveys with a high description.

Instructional Methods and Strategies. This category consists of four sub- categories: personalizing instruction, facilitating student-student interaction, facilitating teacher-student interaction, and facilitating student-content interaction. In personalizing instruction, the sub-category mean is 3.88, which can be described as high. In particular, mean scores ranged from

3.85 to 3.93. The item with a mean score of 3.93 stated using data collected online and offline to customize students' learning experience with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.85 stated answering students' online and offline course-related questions with a high description.

For facilitating student-student interaction, the sub-category mean is 3.88, which can be described as high. Specifically, mean scores ranged from 3.81 to
3.98.The item with a mean score of 3.98 is monitoring students' online and offline interactions to ensure quality participation with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.81, stated —Facilitating online and offline small group collaboration on my students' projects,‖ with a description of high. In terms of facilitating teacher-student interaction, the sub-category mean is 3.99, which can be described as high. Notably, mean scores ranged from 3.90 to 4.08. The item with a mean score of 4.08 stated responding promptly to online and offline student inquiries with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.90, conveying my personality in online text-based communication with my students with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these four sub-categories under instructional methods and strategies generates a high category mean of 3.92. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.81 to 4.08. The item with a mean score of 4.08 with a high description is responding promptly to online and offline student inquiries. On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 3.81 is facilitating online and offline small group collaboration on projects of my students with a high description.

Assessment and Evaluation. This category consists of two sub- categories, namely, implementing blended assessment, and evaluating and reflecting. For implementing blended assessment, the sub-category mean is 3.93, which can be described as high. In particular, mean scores ranged from 3.90 to 3.95. The item with a mean score of 3.95 is administering online and offline performance-based assessments with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.90 stated using data from online and offline assessments to identify patterns in group and whole-class learning gaps with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these two sub-categories under assessment and evaluation generates a high category mean of 3.94. Notably, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.90 to 3.98. The item with a mean score of
3.98 uses students' performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers' online and offline instruction with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.90 stated using data from online and offline assessments to identify patterns in group and whole-class learning gaps with a high description.

Management. This category consists of two sub-categories: managing the learning environment and managing the blended learning routines. In managing the learning environment, the sub-category mean is 3.90, which can be described as high. In particular, mean scores ranged from 3.80 to 3.97. The item with a mean score of 3.97 is configuring my classroom space as needed to support the planned offline and online classroom-based activities with a high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.80 stated helping my students manage their class-related online accounts and passwords with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these two sub-categories under management generates a high category mean of 3.92. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.80 to 3.97. The item with a mean score of 3.97 with a high description manages the blended learning routines, and I manage a classroom where my students pursue mastery at their own

pace and configuring my classroom space as needed to support the planned offline and online classroom-based activities.

On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 3.80 is helping my students to manage their class-related online accounts and passwords with a high description. Also, considering the degrees of dispersion in the extent of student-centered learning implementation, the standard deviation is 0.58, indicating that the responses are relatively clustered around the mean.

The Extent of Student-Centered Learning Implementation

Table 2 presents the computed mean scores on the extent of student- centered learning implementation in the public elementary schools in Region XII. The extent of student-centered learning implementation contains four indicators: involvement in district SCL activities and impact on instruction and assessment, school support and collaborative culture, instructional practice, and teachers‘ professional development.

It can be seen from the table that the overall mean for the extent of student- centered learning implementation is 4.22, which can be described as very high. The overall mean score was based on the mean scores of 4.19 for district LSC activities and impact on instruction and assessment, 4.19 for school support and collaborative culture, 4.21 for instructional practice, and 4.29 for teachers‘ professional development.

Involvement in District LSC Activities and Impact on Instruction and Assessment. This category consists of four sub-categories: personal involvement, preparation to support student learning, frequency of instruction, and assessment methods. In personal involvement, the sub-category mean is 4.31, which can be described as very high. Specifically, mean scores ranged from 4.19 to 4.51. The item with a mean score of 4.51 is enhancing student- centered learning with a very high description. On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 4.19 stated impacting student engagement and college and career readiness this past year with a high description.

Table 2
Extent of Student-Centered Learning Implementation

A. **Involvement in District LSC Activities and Impact on Instruction and Assessment**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Description**
1. Personal Involvement			
1.1 Enhancing student-centered learning.	4.51	.55	Very High
1.2 Impacting my instruction in the past year which further enhances student-centered learning.	4.35	.57	Very High
1.3 Impacting student engagement and/or college and career readiness this past year.	4.19	.61	High
1.4 Impacting what, when, where, and from whom students learned in the past year.	4.20	.60	Very High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.31**	**.47**	**Very High**
2. Preparation to Support Student Learning			
2.1 Supporting collaboration among students which encourages them to interact with peers as part of classroom learning, rely on help and support from classmates to complete assignments, and/or receive and use feedback from peers to revise work.	4.32	.62	Very High
2.2 Supporting personalization which includes helping students have input on the design and goals of classroom learning, have personalized pathways to college/career readiness, have choice over how to demonstrate proficiency, and/or work at their own pace to master content.	4.28	.62	Very High
2.3 Supporting critical thinking or problem solving among students that includes work on tasks with no single correct answer, apply previously learned content to new problems and new contexts, and/or support ideas with evidence.	4.24	.61	Very High

2.4 Supporting student self-regulation and academic tenacity by giving students with opportunities to demonstrate persistence, assess the quality of their own work as they proceed, and/or modify their approach when faced with obstacles to achieving long-term goals.	4.24	.61	Very High
2.5 Supporting anywhere/anytime learning among students by having them to participate in learning outside the school day/school building, such as blended learning, flipped learning, virtual learning, and/or extended learning opportunities, such as internships or service learning.	4.16	.63	High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.25**	**.51**	**Very High**
3. Frequency of Instruction			
3.1 Providing collaboration among students which encourages them to interact with peers as part of classroom learning, rely on help and support from classmates to complete assignments, and/or receive and use feedback from peers to revise work.	4.37	.62	Very High
3.2 Providing personalization which includes helping students have input on the design and goals of classroom learning, have personalized pathways to college/career readiness, have choice over how to demonstrate proficiency, and/or work at their own	4.27	.64	Very High

Continuation of Table 2

3.3 Providing critical thinking or problem solving among students that includes work on tasks with no single correct answer, apply previously learned content to new problems and new contexts, and/or support ideas with evidence.	4.26	.65	Very High
3.4 Providing student self-regulation and academic tenacity by giving students with opportunities to demonstrate persistence, assess the quality of their own work as they proceed, and/or modify their approach when faced with obstacles to achieving long-term goals.	4.26	.65	Very High
3.5 Providing anywhere/anytime learning among students by having them to participate in learning outside the school day/school building, such as blended learning, flipped learning, virtual learning, and/or extended learning opportunities, such as internships or service learning.	4.24	.63	Very High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.28**	**.54**	**Very High**
4. Assessment Methods			
4.1 Implementing traditional quizzes or tests.	4.00	.70	High
4.2 Requiring portfolio submissions and accompanying rationale.	4.03	.69	High
4.3 Encouraging classroom participation.	4.21	.85	Very High
4.4 Conducting end-of-course or end-of-term exams.	4.17	.76	High
4.5 Extending (more than a week long) individual projects.	3.85	.73	High
4.6 Extending (more than a week long) collaborative projects.	3.82	.72	High
4.7 Requiring daily homework and daily check-ins.	3.80	.84	High
4.8 Asking student writing (essays, reports, etc.).	3.74	.80	High
4.9 Requiring journals, lab books or notebooks.	3.81	.78	High

4.10 Encouraging student presentation to class.	3.98	.86	High
4.11 Implementing student presentation at a public event or to a panel of students, teachers, administrators and/or community members.	3.70	.86	High
Sub-Category Mean	**3.92**	**.53**	**High**
Category Mean	**4.19**	**.43**	**High**
B. **School Support and Collaborative Culture**			
1. School Support for various Student-centered Practices			
1. Supporting alternative pathways to graduation.	4.17	.69	High
2. Personalizing instruction to meet student needs.	4.26	.71	Very High
3. Participating in extended learning opportunities for credit	4.16	.69	High
4. Using of instructional technology to personalize and advance student learning.	4.18	.63	High
5. Supporting the expectation that all students can reach high standards.	4.06	.74	High
6. Regulating students in their own learning and setting their own pace.	4.07	.66	High
7. Using of multiple measures of student performance to assess mastery and to determine whether/when students advance to more challenging content.	4.11	.65	High
8. Setting and meeting long term goals of students.	4.05	.66	High
9. Supporting student voice and leadership.	4.12	.66	High

Continuation of Table 2

10. Using of clearly articulated student proficiencies to guide student learning within and across subjects	4.15	.63	High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.13**	**.52**	**High**
2. Practices that foster Collaborative Culture			
11. *Most teachers in my school are,…*			
11.1 Having similar ideas about how students learn.	4.13	.62	High
11.2 Familiarizing with each other's teaching goals.	4.23	.63	Very High
11.3 Familiarizing with each other's classroom practices.	4.18	.67	High
11.4 Having a shared vision of effective instruction.	4.28	.64	Very High
11.5 Having similar ideas about how student work should be assessed.	4.20	.62	Very High
11.6 Asking for assistance from one another.	4.38	.63	Very High
11.7 Sharing teaching strategies with each other.	4.33	.68	Very High
11.8 Sharing responsibility for the success of all our students.	4.43	.63	Very High
11.9 Having opportunities to observe one another.	4.14	.76	High
11.10 Wanting to be observed by other teachers.	4.16	.75	High
11.11Working together in reviewing student work or student data to inform instruction.	4.26	.68	Very High
11.12 Working together in planning curriculum and/or instruction.	4.28	.67	Very High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.25**	**.50**	**Very High**
Category Mean	**4.19**	**.47**	**High**

C. **Instructional Practice**			
1. Instructional Activities			
1. Organizing and facilitating student-led activities.	4.28	.64	Very High
2. Providing students with in-depth guidance on the content or organization of their work.	4.30	.62	Very High
3. Answering procedural questions about individual or group work and/or help my students stay on task.	4.22	.64	Very High
4. Asking open-ended questions to promote engagement with big ideas.	4.24	.67	Very High
5. Giving written feedback on my students' work.	4.23	.67	Very High
6. Giving oral feedback on my students' work.	4.26	.68	Very High
7. Letting my students explore alternative methods for solving problems/conducting investigations.	4.22	.63	Very High
8. Modifying or adjusting instruction based on informal classroom assessments.	4.24	.62	Very High
9. Modeling for my students how to approach a problem or task.	4.28	.65	Very High
10. Using technology to personalize instruction.	4.23	.70	Very High
11. Differentiating activities or instruction to meet individual students' needs.	4.28	.65	Very High
12. Making connections between content and/or activities and students personalized learning plans of pathways.	4.24	.63	Very High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.25**	**.51**	**Very High**
2. Student Learning Activities			
13. In my class, my students are,…			
13.1 participating student-led discussions or activities	4.19	.62	High
13.2 participating in discussions led by the teacher	4.21	.69	Very High
13.3 listening to teacher presentation/lecture	4.32	.65	Very High
13.4 making formal presentations to the class	4.22	.65	Very High
13.5 working together in pairs or small groups on an	4.31	.64	Very High

Sub-Category Mean	**4.17**	**.49**	**High**
Category Mean	**4.21**	**.47**	**Very High**
D. **Teachers' Professional Development**			
1. Teacher Attitude about their Professional Development			
1.1. Participating in professional development opportunities that focused on student-centered learning.	4.34	.64	Very High
1.2. Participating in activities that pursue professional development opportunities focused on student-centered learning.	4.29	.67	Very High
1.3. Participating in activities that encouraged me to experiment my teaching.	4.28	.67	Very High
1.4. Participating in different opportunities for professional development.	4.28	.65	Very High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.30**	**.57**	**Very High**
2. Teacher Professional Development Experiences			
2.1. Involving in planning for my professional development.	4.27	.64	Very High
2.2. Developing an individual professional development plan.	4.23	.66	Very High
2.3. Giving time to work with other teachers as part of my professional development.	4.33	.66	Very High
2.4. Giving time to reflect on what I have learned and how to apply it to my classroom.	4.34	.62	Very High
2.5. Receiving support as I try to implement what I have learned.	4.27	.64	Very High
2.6. Receiving the professional development I need to implement student-centered learning practices in my classroom.	4.22	.69	Very High
Sub-Category Mean	**4.28**	**.55**	**Very High**
Category Mean	**4.29**	**.59**	**Very High**
Over-all Mean	**4.22**	**.52**	**Very High**

Regarding preparation to support student learning, the sub-category mean is 4.25, which can be described as very high. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 4.16 to 4.32. The item that has a mean score of 4.32 is supporting collaboration among students, which encourages them to interact with peers as part of classroom learning, rely on help and support from classmates to complete assignments, and receive and use feedback from peers to revise work with a description of very high. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 4.16 stated supporting anywhere/anytime learning among students by having them participate in learning outside the school day/school building, such as blended learning, flipped learning, virtual learning, and extended learning opportunities, such as internships or service- learning with a description of high.

In terms of frequency of instruction, the sub-category mean is 4.28, which can be described as very high. Further, it is shown that the means of the items in this category are ranging from 4.24 to 4.37. The item that has a mean score of 4.37 is providing collaboration among students, which encourages them to interact with peers as part of classroom learning, rely on help and support from classmates to complete assignments, and receive and use feedback from peers to revise work with a description of very high. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 4.24 stated providing anywhere/anytime learning among students by having them participate in learning outside the school day/school building, such as blended learning, flipped learning, virtual learning, and extended learning opportunities, such as internships or service-learning with a description of very high.

In addition, the sub-category mean of assessment methods is 3.92, which can be described as high. Notably, mean scores ranged from 3.70 to 4.21. The item with a mean score of 4.21 is encouraging class participation with a very high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 3.70 stated implementing students' presentation at a public event or to a panel of students, teachers, administrators, and community members with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these four sub-categories under involvement in district LSC activities and impact on instruction and assessment, the public elementary schools got a high category mean score of 4.19. Notably, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.70 to 4.51. The item that has the means score of 4.51 with a very high description involves in-school initiatives that enhance student-centered learning. On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 3.70 is implementing student presentation at a public event or to a panel of students, teachers, administrators, and community members with a high description.

School Support and Collaborative Culture. This category consists of two sub-categories: school support for various student-centered practices and practices that foster a collaborative culture. For school support for various student-centered practices on this sub-category, it has a mean score of 4.13, which can be described as high. The items in this category obtained ratings ranging from 4.05 to 4.26. Particularly, the item with a mean rating of 4.26 stated personalizing instruction to meet student needs with a very high description. On the other hand, the item with a mean rating of 4.05 is setting and meeting students' long-term goals, which is described as high.

Further, teachers endorse a high sub-category mean rating of 4.29 for the practices that foster a collaborative culture. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 4.13 to 4.43. The item with a mean rating of 4.43, which is described as very high, is sharing responsibility for the success of all our students—on the other hand, having similar ideas on how students learn obtained a mean rating of 4.13 described as high.

Combining the mean scores of these two sub-categories under school support and collaborative culture, the public elementary schools got a category mean score of 4.19, described as high. As gleaned from the results, mean scores ranged from 4.05 to 4.43. The item with the mean score of 4.43 stated most teachers share responsibility for all our students' success with a very high description. On the other hand, one item has a mean score of 4.05, stated setting, and meets long-term goals with a high description.

Instructional Practice. This category consists of two sub-categories, namely, instructional activities and student learning activities. In instructional activities, it generates a sub-category mean of 4.25, which can be described as very high. Further, it is shown that the means of the items in this sub-category are ranging from 4.22 to 4.30. Particularly, the item providing students with in- depth guidance on the content or organization of their work got a mean rating of 4.30,

described as very high. In contrast, the items that obtained a mean rating of 4.26 stated answering procedural questions about individual or group work and help students stay on task, and letting my students explore alternative methods for solving problems/conducting investigations described both as very high.

Likewise, teachers endorse a very high sub-category mean rating of 4.17 in terms of student learning activities. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 3.94 to 4.32. The item listening to teacher presentation/lecture got a mean rating of 4.32, which can be described as very high. On the other hand, the item designing or implementing their investigations or research projects obtained a mean rating of 3.94 with a high description.

Combining the mean scores of these two sub-categories under instructional planning, public elementary schools in Region XII got a category mean score of 4.21, described as very high. Specifically, mean scores ranged from 3.94 to 4.2. The item with a mean score of 4.32 with a very high description in my class; my students are listening to teacher presentation/lecture. On the other hand, the item with a mean score of 3.94 is in my class; my students are designing or implementing their investigations or research projects with a high description.
Teachers' Professional Development. In addition, this category consists of two sub-categories, namely, teacher attitude about their professional development and teachers professional development experiences. For teacher attitude about their professional development, the sub-category mean is 4.30, which can be described as very high. The items in this category obtained ratings within the range of 4.28 to 4.34. Particularly, the item participating in professional development opportunities that focuses on student-centered learning got a mean rating of 4.34, which can be described as very high. In contrast, the items with a mean rating of 4.28 stated participating in activities that encouraged me to experiment with my teaching and participate in different professional development opportunities described both as very high.

Further, teachers endorse a very high mean rating of 4.28 for teachers' professional development experiences. On the one hand, their responses show that the items are ranging from 4.22 to 4.33. In particular, the item stated giving time to work with other teachers as part of my professional development got a mean rating of 4.33, described as very high. On the other hand, the item receiving the professional development I need to implement student- centered learning practices in my classroom has likewise obtained a mean rating of 4.22, described as very high.

Combining the mean scores of these two sub-categories under teachers' professional development, the public elementary schools got a category mean score of 4.32, described as very high. Based on the results presented, mean scores ranged from 4.22 to 4.34. The item with the mean score of 4.34 stated participating in professional development opportunities that focused on student-centered learning and giving time to reflect on what I have learned and how to apply it to my classroom with a very high description. On the other hand, one item with a mean score of 4.22 stated receiving the professional development I need to implement student-centered learning practices in my classroom with a very high description.

Likewise, considering the degrees of dispersion in the extent of student- centered learning implementation, the standard deviation is .52, indicating that the responses are relatively clustered around the mean.

Influence of Blended Teaching Readiness to Extent of Implementation of Student-Centered Learning

Table 3 shows the influence of blended teaching readiness to the extent of implementation of student-centered learning. The finding shows that blended teaching readiness has a p-value of less than .05 and a positive standardized beta value of .590. This indicates that for every unit increase in the blended teaching readiness of the teachers, there is a corresponding .590 increase in the implementation of student-centered learning.

Table 3
Influence of Blended Teaching Readiness to Extent of Implementation of Student-Centered Learning

Predictor	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T	p-value	Remarks
Blended Teaching Readiness	.590	11.504	.000	Significant

Note: R=.590, R-square=.348, F=132.340, P<.05

Furthermore, the table explains 35 percent of the extent of implementation of student-centered learning of the teachers as revealed in the R-squared value of .348. This suggests that 65 percent of the variance can be attributed to other factors aside from the blended teaching readiness of the teachers.

Qualitative Phase

The Lived Experiences of Participants regarding their Implementation of Student-Centered Learning as regards their Blended Teaching Readiness

Essential themes emerged based on the responses of public elementary school teachers during an in-depth interview using a validated open-ended interview guide. This interview guide deals with the participants' lived experiences about their implementation of student-centered learning with their blended teaching readiness in Region XII. It talked about their lived experiences, evaluation, challenges they experienced, activities and resources they utilized, and the status of the sufficiency of the available resources throughout their implementation of student-centered learning.

From the responses of the teacher participants during an in-depth interview, eight essential themes were drawn out, namely, emphasizing deep learning and understanding of students, using the most appropriate instructional strategies to support the learning objectives, coaching learners and allowing participation in key decisions of their learning experience, collaborative/ supportive environment emphasized feedback and capacity building, a non-conducive learning environment, balancing demands of teaching, managing classroom-related issues, and diversifying instructional methods. Thus, the essential themes that emerged from the transcriptions of the participants were summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Lived Experiences of the Participants regarding their Implementation of Student-Centered Learning as regards their Blended Teaching Readiness

Issues Probed	Core Ideas	Codes	Essential Themes
Their Views on Student-Centered Learning	• letting them work collaboratively to improve their skills • give opportunities to show and participate actively • allowing them to discover • chance to explore of his or her own to develop his or her critical thinking • allowed to articulate their ideas, and given a chance to learn at their own pace • students from passive receivers of information to active participants in their own discovery process • let the student work independently through learning by doing wherein teachers serve as the facilitator of learning	Increased autonomy of the learner	Emphasizing Deep Learning and Understanding of Students
	• a teacher needs to initiate or think of a strategy in order to meet the needs of the learners • engaging your students through guided discovery • engaging learners in different activities which focuses on their skills and lifelong learning • uses interactive strategies to engage the students and develop their abilities • engaging the students in the educative process	Modeling students how to think	
	• students are the main focus in education process wherein teacher will only act as facilitator of learning • focused on the students' interest • student to be the center of the teaching and learning process • learning process are focused only for the benefits of school children • prioritizing students	Accommodate learners involvement in the learning process	
Their Views on Blended Learning Environment	• combination of classroom setting and computer- based activities • face to face and online learning is combined just to reach out the students and deliver to them the learning they need • face-face learning to computer based instruction • learners have a direct or indirect contact with the teacher	Teacher supports instruction	Using the Most Appropriate Instructional Strategies to Support the Learning Objectives

	● combination of different approaches like online modules, radio based instruction, printed and offline modular learning. ● It is an environment wherein students can learn in many ways using the different types of modalities or teaching strategies ● combination of the different learning modalities ● encompasses different types of learning modalities such as online, modular, TV and radio broadcasting		
Extent of Implementation on Student-Centered Learning	● we involve them in different activities so that they can learn by doing ● caters learner's capabilities that suit their learning abilities. ● personalized learning to own their learning opportunities ● we ask our learners about their interests and affinities through inventories and pre-testing, we allow our students to make decisions.	Student owned learning	Coaching Learners and Allowing Participation in Key Decisions of their Learning Experience
	● teachers are using localized activities in addition to the modules that they are using ● prepares modules that are aligned to all the needs of our learners ● teachers act as the facilitator of learning ● we are responsible for preparing learning activities they need	Teachers as facilitator	
Practices of the School in the implementation of student-centered learning	● collaborative culture because the school, PTA and other stakeholders work on a regular basis to ensure that every learner receives good education and to guarantee their holistic development ● collaborative culture is the extensively implemented in our school because we have asupportive teachers, school head and stakeholders ● collaborative culture, we support each other and working together for our learners is one of our ultimate goals. ● collaborative culture because we have a strong partnership with our colleagues and stakeholders.	Collaborative Culture	Collaborative/ Supportive Environment Emphasizing Feedback and Capacity Building
	● instruction and assessment since we really prioritize the welfare of our students we make sure that they have proper materials suited to their levels of understanding and can explore ideas from those materials given. ● instruction is based on the set standards or in the curriculum ● Instructional practices, we have almost 100% passing rate because we try to reach out learners by all means. ● the instructions are based on pupils' ability to learn, their interests and needs ● conduct a 2-day home visitation to our learners to ensure that they do their learning activities in today's situation	Focus on Instruction and Assessment	

Continuation of Table 5

	● professional development because we need more trainings and seminars ● professional development because of limited time to conduct activities that will update teachers ● professional development still we need to improve our self ● professional development because teachers have limited knowledge on how to implement student-centered learning	Continuous Professional Development of Teachers	
Challenges Experienced	● some students are not interested ● our students lack interest and motivation because of hunger ● students differences in terms of behavior and sometimes due to time adjustments ● some students are not interested, disruptive behavior and sometimes lack of enthusiasm in answering their activities ● students have different interests and sometimes it is quite difficult to keep their focus on the discussion. ● behavior of the students to learning ● students' lack of interest and motivation ● lack of pupils interest and disruptive behavior of pupils	Students' lack of interest	Non-conducive Learning Environment
	● lack of support coming from the parents due to poverty and educational background ● lack of parental guidance ● lack of participation in classroom meetings and conferences of parents ● not interested in offering time and effort in performing their task	Lack of parental support	
	● insufficient knowledge on implementing this kind of learning ● Limited knowledge of the teachers as a result they deliver limited knowledge on their students ● unwillingness of the teachers to implement the said program ● teachers lack of knowledge and reluctant to changes	Teachers' limited knowledge in implementing student-centered learning	Balancing Demands of Teaching
	● we are not only task to teach but we have non-teaching related tasks wherein we need to spend some of our time, effort and even personal resources doing it ● difficulty in balancing among competing task ● bombarded with so many task ● multiple coordinatorship in school	Other work requirements	
	● class size, because it is really hard to implement student-centered learning if the ratio between teachers and pupils is not right. ● it is really hard to deal and manage when the number of classes is big ● hard to handle class with so many students	Class Size	Managing Classroom Related Issues

Continuation of Table 5

	● we don't have enough resources but we try our best to use localize resources ● poor internet connection ● some available materials but not enough ● few resources which we can use to address the needs of our pupils but we still need to look for better alternatives ● inadequate materials ● lack of technology for students to use ● need more teaching resources	Few teaching resources	
Propositions for the Successful Implementation of Student-Centered Learning	● group activities, games, role play, debate, journal ● reading materials, stage program participation ● interactive lessons wherein students will able to talk or discuss their learnings with their peers ● stage presentation, group activities, games, role play, debate, and journal ● manipulative games or activities where they can use their skills and discover their own potentials ● giving of manipulative games ● games, giving them manipulative materials, storytelling	Employing active and collaborative learning	Diversifying Instructional Methods
	● technologies where students can explore ● LCD , laptop, TV ● watching educational videos ● video clips ● computers for hands-on activities	Integration of technology	

The Role of their Experiences in Shaping their Beliefs and Commitment in Implementing Student-Centered Learning

Five important themes emerged from an in-depth interview of the teacher participants on the role of their experiences in shaping their beliefs and commitment in implementing student-centered. These include individualizing student learning experiences, shifting emphasis from teaching to learning, engaging in inquiry-based learning, obtaining positive mindset, and making right decisions. The essential themes that emerged from the transcriptions of the participants were summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Role of their Experiences in Shaping their Beliefs and Commitment inImplementing Student-Centered Learning

Issues Probed	Core Ideas	Codes	Essential Themes
	● the success of every student depends on how the teacher is skillful in different learning methods ● pertains to the knowledge of teachers on blended teaching readiness ● believe on the importance of learning teaching methods	Relevance of learning methods	

On Beliefs	• different levels of learners so we must knew how to deal with them in a perfect way, how to provide appropriate interventions and activities to solve the existing situation and problems and expert to deal with them • enable the teachers cater the individual needs • can provide, give, supply, enhance and maximize ones' potentials, abilities and skills as to prioritized the needs of students	Students have different learning needs	Individualizing student learning experiences
	• pupils are not lost in their learning process but it is continuous learning • offers and promotes deeper learning and increases student satisfaction from those learning opportunities more than the traditional way of teaching • provides variety of learning of methods that can develop students holistically	Adapting to individual developmental learning needs of students	Shifting emphasis from teaching to learning
	• caters different learning modalities that response to each student's need and deeper layers of learning • make use of different modalities that offers various learning opportunities more than the old-style teaching which addresses the needs of students • different modalities that offers variety of learning opportunities more than the traditional teaching which addresses the needs of students	Learning modalities offers opportunity for learning	
On Commitment	• must be flexible to cope with the changes • flexible enough to face this new normal way of teaching, we use different modalities which every students prefer to use to learn	Flexibility in teaching	Engaging in Inquiry-Based learning

Continuation of Table 6

	● we need to be flexible in order for us to perform different tasks given efficiently		
	● I need to ready myself and cope with its way of implementation to make me effective in implementing it. ● When you are ready then you are strong enough to implement such a program efficiently and effectively. ● effective preparations help us to become ready	Preparation is necessary	
	● If you really love what you are doing ● passionate in teaching profession ● have that passion to really share your wisdom to your students ● influences us to be more passionate	Passion in teaching is necessary	Obtaining positive mindset
	● because of the positive attitude ● good dispositions about blended teaching ● if you have the enough amount of knowledge then student- centered learning will be made possible	Establishing positive attitude	
	● perseverance and eagerness to embrace the new normal way ● show courage and sincerity in school ● sincerity though we are now in a new normal ● being reliable in our obligations in the workplace by sticking to our moral and ethical principle	Possessing high moral values	Making right decisions
	● willingness to join trainings ● willing to learn more ● willingness to do difficult things ● willing to give 100% support for the implementation of student-centered learning	Having optimistic character	

Data Integration of Salient Quantitative and Qualitative Findings

Table 7 shows the nature of data integration of the joint salient quantitative and qualitative findings in evaluating the blended teaching readiness of teachers about the implementation of student-centered learning. The first column presents the aspects or focal points of the study, followed by the second and third columns where the quantitative and qualitative findings are revealed. The fourth column justifies the idea of integration, it may also be the nature or function of data integration, and the fifth column emphasizes the axiological implications of the findings.

Blended Teaching Readiness. The quantitative finding found in table 1 merges and converges with the qualitative finding found in table 5. Table 1 reflects the status of blended teaching readiness of teachers under instructional planning which is described as high with a total mean score of 3.92 (SD=.579).

Specifically, on planning blended activities (Mean=3.94, SD=594): statement 1.1 stated I create activities that combine online and offline components to help my students develop important life skills

such as creativity, critical thinking, communication, and collaboration with a mean score of 3.97 (SD= .741), statement 1.3 which stated that I strategically combine online and offline activities that enable student ownership of their learning (e.g., flexibility in when, where and how they learn) with a mean score of 3.94 (SD=.708), statement 1.4 stated that I incorporate existing online and offline educational materials into learning activities with a mean score of 3.92 (SD=.678) and
statement 1.5 which stated that I create new online and offline learning materials when relevant content is not available with a mean score of 3.90 (SD=.687).

In the qualitative findings on Table 5 on lived experiences of the participants with the following codes, the teacher supports instruction and transforms traditional instructional. With these data, the nature of data integration is merging while the functional integration is converging. Its axiological implication entails that teachers' understanding of blended learning influences their support and implementation of blended activities and assessment.

Also, Table 1 in the status of blended teaching readiness of teachers under foundational knowledge, skills, and dispositions is described as high with a total mean score of 3.93 (SD=.498). Specifically, regarding my dispositions (Mean=4.01, SD=.545): statement 3.4 stated that I believe it is important for teachers to explore new teaching strategies that blend offline and online learning with a mean score of 4.16 (SD=.718). The qualitative finding in Table 6 on Role of Experiences with the themes individualizing student learning experiences and shifting emphasis from teaching to learning. It resulted in merging as the nature of data integration and converging as the functional integration. Its axiological implication entails that reflective practice of teaching bridges the transition from traditional to a blended instruction.

Table 7

Joint Display of the Salient Qualitative and Quantitative Findings

Focal Point	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Findings	Nature of Data Integration	Axiological Implications
Blended Teaching Readiness	Table 1 in Status of Blended Teaching Readiness of Teachers under Instructional Planning which is described as high with a total mean score of 3.92 (SD=.579). Specifically on *planning blended activities* (Mean=3.94,SD=594) : statement 1.1 with a mean score of 3.97 (SD=.741), statement 1.3 with a mean score of 3.94 (SD=.708), statement 1.4 with a mean score of 3.92 (SD=.678) and statement 1.5 with a mean score of 3.90 (SD=.687)	Table 5 on Lived Experiences of the Participants with the following codes Teacher supports instruction and Transform traditional instruction	Merging-Converging	Teachers' understanding of blended learning influences their support and implementation of blended activities and assessment.
	Table 1 in Status of Blended Teaching Readiness of Teachers under Foundational Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions which is described as high with a total mean score of 3.93 (SD=.498). Specifically, *regarding my dispositions* (Mean=4.01, SD=.545)*:* statement 3.4 with a mean score of 4.16	Table 6 on Role of Experiences with the theme Individualizing student learning experiences and Shifting emphasis from teaching to learning	Merging-Converging	Reflective practice of teaching bridges the transition from traditional to a blended instruction.

Continuation of Table 7

	(SD=.718) .			
Implementation of Student-Centered Learning	Table 2 in Extent of Student-Centered Learning Implementation on Involvement in District LSC Activities and Impact on Instruction and Assessment specifically on school initiatives which is described as high with a total mean score of 4.19 (SD=.433). Specifically, category 2 (Mean=4.25, SD.508): statement 2.1 with a mean score of 4.32 (SD=.621), and category 3 (Mean=4.28, SD=.541) statement 3.1 with a mean score 4.37 (SD=.622).	Table 5 on Lived Experiences of the Participants with the code Increased autonomy of the students	Merging-Converging	Collaborative activities allow students to explore and use creativity in problem solving.
	Table 2 in Extent of Student-Centered Learning Implementation on Involvement in District LSC Activities and Impact on Instruction and Assessment specifically on school initiatives which is described as high with a total mean score of 4.19 (SD=.4330). Specifically, category 2 (Mean=4.25, SD=.508): statement 2.2 with a mean score of 4.28	Table 5 on Lived Experiences of the Participants with the code Student owned learning	Merging-Converging	Allowing students to have a choice and voice in what they want to study makes them realize the relevance of learning.

Continuation of Table 7

	(SD=.622), and category 3 (Mean=4.28, SD=.541) statement 3.2 with a mean score of 4.27 (SD=.637).			
	Table 2 in Extent of Student-Centered Learning Implementation on Instructional Practice which is described as very high with a total mean score of 4.21 (SD=.473). Specifically, the category on teaching practice (Mean=4.25, SD=.504): statement 1 with a mean score of 4.28 (SD=.636), statement 7 with a mean score of 4.22 (SD=.624), statement 11 with a mean score of 4.28 (SD=.646), and statement 12 with a mean score of 4.24 (SD=.632).	Table 5 on Lived Experiences of the Participants with the following codes Modeling students how to think and Teacher as facilitator.	Merging-Converging	Innovative methods of teaching and personalized learning enable students to learn important life skills.
	Table 2 in Extent of Student-Centered Learning Implementation on School Support and Collaborative Culture which is described as high with a total mean score of 4.19 (SD=.469). Specifically, the category of teachers with a mean score of 4.25 (SD=.504). Table 2 in Extent of Student-Centered Learning	Table 5 on Lived Experiences of the Participants with the theme Collaborative/ Supportive Environment Emphasizing on Feedback and Capacity Building	Merging-Converging	Teachers should continually reflect and recognize areas for professional development for them to be able to pursue and align teaching objectives, methods and assessment consistently.

Continuation of Table 7

	Implementation on Teachers' Professional Development which is described as very high with a mean score of 4.28 (SD=.547).			
Blended Teaching Readiness and Implementation of Student-Centered Learning	Table 3 affirmed that blended teaching readiness influence the implementation of student-centered learning (t=11.504, p=.000). A level increase in the blended teaching readiness is .590 increases in the implementation of student-centered learning.	Table 6 on Role of Experiences with the codes flexibility in teaching, establishing positive attitude, possessing high moral values, and having optimistic character, Adapting to individual developmental learning needs of students	Merging-Converging	School Leaders should build a community where administrators and teachers utilize their strengths to help and grow together.

CONCLUSIONS

The status of blended teaching readiness of teachers was rated high. This means that the blended teaching readiness of teachers is often manifested in the public elementary schools in Region XII. It entails that teachers are equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge for blended learning instruction. Similarly, the extent of student-centered learning implementation was rated very high. This means that implementing student-centered learning is always evident in the public elementary schools in Region XII. It entails that teachers display their competence in the implementation of student-centered learning. Further, Blended teaching readiness has a significant relationship with the extent of implementation of student-centered learning.

In the qualitative aspect, eight essential themes emerged relevant to the participants' lived experiences about their implementation of student-centered learning concerning their blended teaching readiness in Region XII. Thus, the essential themes included emphasizing deep learning and understanding of students, using the most appropriate instructional strategies to support the learning objectives, coaching learners and allowing

participation in key decisions of their learning experience, collaborative/ supportive environment emphasizing feedback and capacity building, non-conducive learning environment, balancing demands of teaching, managing classroom-related issues, and diversifying instructional methods. These themes highlight how student-centered learning was practiced in the selected public elementary schools in Region XII.

In addition, five emerging themes described the role of participants' experiences in shaping their beliefs and commitment in implementing student- centered learning. These essential themes include individualizing student learning experiences, shifting emphasis from teaching to learning, engaging in inquiry-based learning, obtaining positive mindset, and making right decisions. These themes highlight how the beliefs and commitment of public elementary school teachers are shaped through their experience in the implementation of student-centered learning in Region XII. Furthermore, the quantitative data corroborate the qualitative findings of this study. The nature and function of the data integration of the salient quantitative and qualitative findings were merging-converging.

REFERENCES

Anoba, J. L. D. & Cahapay, M. B. (2020). The Readiness of Teachers on Blended Learning Transition for Post-COVID-19 Period: An Assessment Using Parallel Mixed Method. PUPIL: *International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning*, 4(2), 295-316

Atweh, D. (2017). *Foundations of Curriculum*. Lecture, Philippine Normal University.

Barbour, M. (2011). Online and Blended Learning: A Survey of Policy and Practice of K-12 Schools Around the World, Wayne State University

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Braun V., & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*

Campbell, A. (2020). COVID-19 Best Practices for Equitable & Inclusive Student-

Centred Learning https://www.mcgill.ca/equity/resources/covid-19-best

Classrooms

CNN, (2020).*CNN Philippines*, Retrieved: October 12, 2020 https://cnnphilippines.com/life/culture/2020/6/1/academic-freeze-opinion.html

COVID- 19: A national survey of medical students in the Philippines

Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49(1), 5-22

Di Pietro, G., Biagi, F., Costa P., Karpiński Z., & Mazza, J., (2020). The likely impact of COVID-19 on education: *Reflections based on the existing literature and recent international datasets.*

Doguiles, D., (2020) South Cotabato students prefer modular learninghttps://pia.gov.ph/news/articles/1049744

https?2012bookslard/bucket.org/books/beginningpsychology/05-03chaptersummary/html

Kumar, M. K. (2016). Challenges of Implementing Student-centered Strategies in

Learner-Centeredness, Philippine Normal University

Lewis, J.L. & Sheppard, S. R. J., (2006). Culture and communication: can landscape visualization improve forest management consultation with indigenous communities? *Landscape and Urban Planning* 77:291–313.

Magsambol, B. (2020). Philippines' COVID-19 cases now at 115,980

Mclaughlin, J. E., Gharkholonarehe, N., Khanova, J., Deyo Z. M. & Rogers, J. E.,

(2015).The Impact of Blended Learning of student performance in a 220 cardiovascular pharmacotherapy course. *American Journal Pharmaceutical Education*

Parreno, E. B., & Jimenez, R. O. (2014). *Basic statistics: A worktext*. (2nd ed.).

Parsons, A. W., Ankrum, J. W., & Morewood, A. (2016). Professional development to promote teacher adaptability. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(3), 250–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1173995 practices- equitable-inclusive-student-centred-learning *Research in Psycholog*y. 2006;3(2):77-101

Reyes, J. C. & Baticulon, R., (2020). *Barriers to online learning in the time of*

Riggs, S. (2020). Student-Centered Remote Teaching: Lessons Learned from Online Education, *Teaching and Learning*

Rivera, J., (2017). Articulating the Foundations of Philippine K to 12 Curriculum:

Schmitz, A. (2012). *Beginning psychology*. Retrieved on August, 12, 2019, from

Tham, K., & Tham, C., (2011). *Blended Learning* – A Focus Study on Asia.

Uy, A. R. (2020). *—Blended Learning*‖ In Virus-Hit Philippines https://theaseanpost.com/article/blended-learning-virus-hit-philippines