



THE PEDAGOGUE

Vol (1), No. (1)

Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Learner Centered Approach

Dr. Muhammad Younes¹, Ms. Irum Hassan²

Keywords:

Learner centered approach,
Effectiveness, Activity based
learning, Personality Development.

$\overline{ABSTRACT}$

Primarily this study is Descriptive in nature having a blend of both quantitative and qualitative approaches. The main objective of the study was to determine the Teachers Perception regarding learners centered approach in the teaching learning process. The design of the study was Case Study, where the entire teaching faculty of the City University was taken as the population of the study. A questionnaire involving four variables: Teachers Perception (TP), Effectiveness (EFF), Personality Development (PD), and Activity Base Learning (ABL). The data so collected was processed applying various statistical tools using SPSS-23. The main conclusion of the study was that the teachers overwhelming confirmed their acceptability and effectiveness of the Learner Centered Approach.

INTRODUCTION

According to Cannon (2002), Lerner Centered Approach gives students an opportunity to express themselves with confidence and learning is based mostly on activities. The focus of students Learner approach is giving an ability of independent thinking with sense of responsibility leading to help in inculcation of knowledge in class. This type of learning is based on deep understanding, inspiration and motivation, ability to manage time, achievement of adequate expertise for assimilation of information. Learning Centered Assessment has a dominant role in the process of learning. With this approach Hub and Freed (2000) have shifted centre of attention towards learner Based approach rather than Teacher Based Approach. According to Collins (2003), "by using students learning approach Students influence the content, activities, material and pace of learning." The real benefit of Students Learning approach is that its focus is on students' needs, aims and objectives to design course in such a way that all are student drive.

Teachers' Perceptions regarding LCA

According to Weimer (2002) there are five prominent ways which can lead to the road to shift from prevalent Teacher Centered Approach to Learner Centered Approach. This approach helps student feel sense of responsibility in learning process, help in adaptation of content driven courses. Teacher's role is shifted from master to facilitator and also provide various assessment techniques to improve learning quality.

¹ Professor, City University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan, Email: hod.education@cusit.edu.pk

²M.Phil. Scholar, City University of Science & Information Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan, Email: thescholar733@yahoo.com

Effectiveness of LCA

Blooms' Taxonomy (1964) of learning outcome elaborates that Remembering and understanding are at the lower level of learning outcome in cognitive domain. King (2002) stated that "Learner- centered educational practices help in implementing higher-level learning objectives, application and analysis."

Personality Development in LCA

Brockbank (2007) argued that the main aspiration is the development of the learners who have the great capacity to learn. The learner is crucial in relation to area of knowledge. The learner is able not only to get knowledge but to bring his self into the process of learning. The teacher, as facilitator, creates conducive environment to make the learners familiar with the learning process.

Activity-based Learning

According to Lee (2015) students who are familiar with activity-based learning style are active and believe in argument rather than to follow blindly. They also express themselves in a project based on teamwork or individually in a program. Such students do not feel hesitation to accept challenges in the way of learning. The classroom is more interactive and collaborative as the students are engaged in discussion and activities. According to Fallow and Ahmet (1999) when there is a boost in connection, investment and association, the learning is at the top.

Theoretical Framework

The conceptual framework of the study evolved as a consequence of review of relevant available literature and previous studies conducted as the theme Teachers' perception, Effectiveness of LCA, Personality Development (PD) and Activity Based Learning (ABL) have been included as the variables of the study.

Objectives of the Study

- The main objective of this study was to determine teachers' perceptions regarding learner-centered-approach (LCA). The study also aimed at the achievement of following objectives.
- To evaluate efficacy of teachers' perceptions regarding effectiveness of LCA
- To determine perceptions regarding the personality development of student in LCA
- To assess the teachers' perceptions towards the activity-based learning in LCA

Hypotheses

H01: Teachers perceive LCA negatively.

H02: Teachers do not perceive the effectiveness of LCA.

H03: Teachers do not perceive the personality development of students in LCA.

H04: Teachers do not perceive activity-based learning in LCA.

METHODS AND PROCEDURE

Relevant literature was consulted to arrive at conceptual frame work and Primary data collection was

made through a questionnaire developed for the purpose with five response division Likert Scale. The questionnaire was pilot tested indicating Cronbach's Alphas ranging from 0.77 to 0.87. The variables involved in the study included Teachers' Perceptions (TP), Effectiveness of LCA (EFF), Personality Development (PD) and Activity Based Learning (ABL).

Population and Sample

The entire teaching faculty comprising 70 teaching faculty members from 7 departments of City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar was the population of the study. However, the sample comprised 63 available faculty members.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Reliability Test

Reliability test of the research instrument indicated Cronbach alphas from 0.73 to 0.85 establishing high reliability level.

Table 1. Reliability Test

Variable (s)	Cronbach's Alpha
TP	0.85
EFF	0.81
PD	0.78
ABL	0.73

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics indicated central tendency with positive mean value meaning by that all respondents were on agreement side. The mean value for TP, EFF, PD, and ABL are 4.0048, 3.8043,3.4022 and 3.9016, respectively is reflected below.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics							
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation		
TP	63	2.20	4.90	4.0048	.60812		
EEF	63	2.54	5.00	3.8043	.55580		
PD	63	2.29	4.43	3.4022	.69794		
ABL	63	2.00	5.00	4.0413	.51073		
Valid N (listwise)	63						

Testing of Hypothesis #1

Teachers perceive LCA negatively.

Table 3(a)

One-Sample Statistics							
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
TP	63	4.0048	.60812	.07662			
TP	63	4.0048 Table 3 (b)	.60812	.07662			

One-Sample t –Test

	Test Valu	e = 3					
	Т	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Difference	Interval of	the
					Lower	Upper	
TP	13.114	62	.000	1.00476	.8516	1.1579	

The result of the One sample t-Test shows the mean value of (TP) as 4.0048 being positive and statistically significant. Therefore, hypothesis #1 stands rejected as the teachers perceive LCA positively.

Testing of Hypothesis #2

Teachers do not perceive the effectiveness of LCA.

Table 4(a)

One-Sample Statistics						
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean		
EFF	63	3.8043	.55580	.07002		
		Table 4 (b)				

The results of the above One sample t-Test showed the mean value of the variable (EFF) as 3.8043 being statistically significant. Therefore, hypothesis #3 is rejected as the teachers perceive the effectiveness of LCA positively.

Testing of Hypothesis #3

Teachers do not perceive personality development of students in LCA.

	Table 5 (a)									
One-S	One-Sample Statistics									
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean						
PD	63	3.4022	.69794	.08793						

Table 5 (b)

T	est Valı	ue = 3				
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confider	nce Interval of the
					Dif	ference
				_	Lower	Upper
PD	4.574	62	.000	.4022	.2264	.5780

The results of the One sample t-Test showed the mean value of the variable (PD) as 3.4022 being positive and statistically significant. The hypothesis is rejected as the teachers perceive the personality development of students in LCA.

Testing of Hypothesis #4

Teachers do not perceive that LCA is Activity based.

	Table 6 (a)							
One-Sample Statistics								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean				
ABL	63	3.9016	.55750	.07024				
		Table	e 6 (b)					

One-Sample t-Test

Test V	alue =	3					
T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean	Difference	95% Co	nfidence Inter	val of the
						Difference	
	Lower	·Upper					
ABL		12.836	62	.000	.90159	.7612	1.0420

The results of the above One sample t-Test indicated the mean value of the variable (ABL) as 3.9016 indicating being statistically significance. Hence hypothesis is rejected as the teachers perceive that LCA is activity-based approach

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Consequent upon the analysis of the collected data certain findings and conclusions were constructed which are provided as follow. The recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions.

Findings

Following findings were made as a consequence of data analysis.

1. Overwhelming majority favoured the adoption of learner centered approach.

- 2. Most of the teachers are of the view that learner-centered-approach contributes towards personality development.
- 3. Teachers perceive that learner-centered-approach generates learner-based activities among the students.
- 4. Teachers perceive that activity-based curriculum develops effective learning among the students.

Conclusion

The study confirmed the acceptability of the learner-centered-curriculum by the teaching faculty. The teaching faculty also endorsed that learner-based curriculum generate curricular and co-curricular activities among the students. Majority of the teaching faculty of City University supported Learner-centered –approach because they thought that it develops student's personality. The study confirmed the effectiveness of the LCA.

Recommendations

Based on findings and conclusions following suggestions were put forwards.

- The study has confirmed that learner-centered approach is more interactive and productive, therefore, the teachers may be trained in adopting learner-centered approach in their teaching learning process.
- As a paradigm shift the in-service training of the teachers may be arranged emphasizing the need and utility of the learner-centered approach.
- 3 The courses and syllabi of the students may be re-structured accordingly to accommodate learner-centered approach.
- 4 The concept of interactive and cooperative teaching may be incorporated in teachers training.
- 5 Performance based evaluations may be introduced to supplement LCA.

REFERENCES

- Allen, D., & Tanner, K. (2005). Infusing active learning into the large-enrolment biology class: seven strategies, from the simple to complex. *Cell Biology Education*, 4(4).
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2002). The open door: Assessing the promise and problems of dual enrolment. AASCU State Policy Briefing, 1(1).
- Archambault, R. D. (1964). John Dewey on Education: selected essays.
- Austin, A. E., & Mc Daniels, M. (2006). Preparing the professoriate of the future: Graduate student socialization for faculty roles. *HIGHER EDUCATION*: 397-456.
- Bain, K. (2011). What the best college teachers do. Harvard University Press.
- Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (2000). From Teaching to Learning. Learning from Change: Landmarks in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education from Change Magazine, 1969-1999.
- Baxter, S., & Gray, C. (2001). The application of student-centred learning approaches to clinical education. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 36(S1), 396-400.
- Berliner, B. A. (2004). Reaching Unmotivated Students. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 69(5).
- Berliner, D. C., & Calfee, R. C. (Eds.). (1996). Handbook of educational psychology. Routledge.

- Biggs, J. B. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Bloom, B. S., & Committee of College and University Examiners. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives (Vol. 2). New York: Longmans, Green
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom.* 1991 ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, The George Washington University, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036-1183.
- Brockbank, A., & McGill, I. (2007). Facilitating reflective learning in higher education. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Brown, J. K. (2008). Student-centered instruction: Involving students in their own education. *Music Educators Journal*, 94(5), 30-35.
- Cannon, R. (2000). Guide to support the implementation of the Learning and Teaching Plan Year 2000. *ACUE*, the University of Adelaide.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE bulletin*.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1999). Development and adaptations of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New directions for teaching and learning*, 1999.
- Chickering, A. W., & Ehrmann, S. C. (1996). Implementing the seven principles: Technology as lever. *AAHE bulletin*, 49, 3-6.
- Collins, J. B. (2003). How do perspectives on teaching vary across disciplinary majors for students enrolled in teacher preparation? *University of British Columbia*.
- Collins III, J. W., & O'Brien (2003). The Greenwood Dictionary of Education.
- Cooper, D. H. (1995). Active shape models-their training and application. *Computer vision and image understanding*, 61(1)
- Dewey, J. (1964). John Dewey on education (R. Archambault, Ed.). Chicago, IL.
- Duffy, T. M., & Jonassen, D. H. (1992). Constructivism: New implications for instructional technology. *Constructivism and the technology of instruction: A conversation*, 1, 16.
- Ebert-May, D., & Allred, S. (1997). Innovation in large lectures: Teaching for active learning. *Bioscience*, 47(9).
- Fallows, S. J., & Ahmet, K. (1999). Inspiring students: Case studies in motivating the
- Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (1996). Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction. *College teaching*, 44(2).
- Filak, V. F., & Sheldon, K. M. (2003). Student psychological need satisfaction and college teacher-course evaluations. *Educational psychology*, 23(3).
- Goldstein, G., & Fernald, P. (2009). Humanistic education in a capstone course. *College Teaching*, 57(1).
- Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). Learner centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24(9).
- James, W. (1992). The Correspondence of William James.

- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1998). *Active learning: Cooperation in the college classroom*. Interaction Book Company, 7208 Cornelia Drive, Edina, MN 55435.
- Kemm, R. E., & Dantas, A. M. (2007). Led Learning in biological science practical activities: supported by student-centred e-Learning. *The FASEB Journal*, 21(5).
- King, D. (2002). Electronic commerce: A managerial perspective 2002. *Prentice Hall: ISBN* 0, 13(975285), 4.
- Kohn, A. J. (2008). U.S. Patent Application No. 12/313,420.
- Kreber, C. (2012). Developing the scholarship of teaching through transformative learning. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(1).
- Lee, H. (2015). From a well-prepared teacher to an on-the-spot facilitator: a reflection on delivering an active learning course. *International Journal for Transformative Research*, 2(1).
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). Classroom assessment & grading that work. ASCD.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). The new taxonomy of educational objectives. Corwin Press
- McCombs, B. L., & Whisler, J. S. (1997). The Learner-Centered Classroom and School: Strategies for Increasing Student Motivation and Achievement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McGrath, J. R. (2011). Linking Pedagogical Practices of Activity-based Teaching. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 6(3).
- Menges, R. J., & Weimer, M. (1996). *Teaching on solid ground: Using scholarship to improve practice*. Jossey-Bass Inc., 350 Sansome St., San Francisco, CA 94104.
- Oermann, M. H. (2004). Using Active Learning in Lecture: Best of Both worlds. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, 1(1).
- Petress, K. (2008). What is meant by "Active Learning? *Education*, 128(4).
- Price, E. A., & Driscoll, M. P. (1997). An inquiry into the spontaneous transfer of problem-solving skill. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22(4).
- Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to teach in higher education. Routledge.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions. Jossey-Bass.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2008). The academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture*.
- Trilling, B., &Fadel, C. (2009). 21st century skills: Learning for life in our times. John Wiley & Sons.
- Van Ments, M. (2011). Just running around: Some reminiscences of early simulation/gaming in the United Kingdom. *Simulation & Gaming*.
- Weimer, M. (2002). Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice. John Wiley & Sons.

.