International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Pedagogy, Heutagogy, or Andragogy: Learners' Preferred Approach

Dr. Raymond S. Manalastas[1], Dona L. Manalastas[2], Francis R. Garcia[3], Angelique S. Quiambao[4]

[1] Salapungan National High School/Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines
[2] Salapungan National High School/Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines
[3] Magumbali Elementary School/Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines
[4] Magumbali Elementary School/Bulacan Agricultural State College, Philippines

ABSTRACT :

The study aims to determine the preferred learning approach of the randomly selected Senior High School students of Salapungan National High School during the S.Y. 2022-2023. Furthermore, the results of the survey were used to identify the teaching strategies to be employed by teachers for maximum learning. Based on the findings of the study, pedagogy emerges as the most preferred learning approach by the respondents. The following conclusions were drawn. Based on the significant findings, it is therefore concluded that "pedagogy" is still the most preferred learning approach of Senior High School students. The teacher still the central figure in the classroom, expected to maneuver the flow of the teaching learning process by proving reliable instructional materials, maintaining classroom ambiance, sustaining students' motivation, and realizing other pertinent roles. The following are the suggested teaching strategies derived from the results of the study: Socratic Seminar, Question Formulation Technique, Tiered Learning Targets, and Bloom's Twist.

Keywords: pedagogy, heutagogy, andragogy.

Introduction :

The manner of teaching tells who the teacher is. The way a teacher teaches describes what type of teacher he is. It is innate for teachers to decide what type of teaching approach he will employ in the class. He is also aware that every strategy he employed will affect the academic performance of his class, so he must be sensitive enough to choose the suited approach for his students.

A teacher is left with a lot of options for what to pursue. What is most important is that he should always consider his learners' preferences. Pedagogy is an instructional strategy used in formal education settings to teach young students by emphasizing academic content and conceptual ideas. This is the result of combining learning activities, learning assessment, and teaching methodology. Although the term "pedagogy" may seem complex, it simply refers to the approach and practice of teaching in general, particularly when it comes to academic subjects or theoretical ideas.

Heutagogy, or self-determined learning, on the other hand, is a student-centered teaching approach. The growth of capability, autonomy, and capacity is emphasized. Conversely, andragogy is the science of teaching adults and the practice of doing so. Although andragogy and pedagogy share some similarities, there are also many differences that an instructor or trainer needs to be aware of and take into consideration. Generally, this method is very self-directed, hands on, and not reliant on an instructor or teacher.

There is difference between pedagogy and andragogy that affects their academic performance, first is learning behavior, in pedagogy learners are not directed and still depends on their teachers throughout the learning process, in andragogy, learners are more responsible for their own learning. The second factor is the experience of the learners; in pedagogy, learners provide little personal experience and cannot be used as learning resources; in andragogy, learners contribute richer resources from one another as well as a greater volume and quality of experience. Thirdly, there is learning orientation. In pedagogy, this refers to the process of acquiring prescribed subject matter; in andragogy, on the other hand, learners seek to apply real-life situations to improve their performance and enrich their lives. These represent only a few of the distinctions between andragogy and pedagogy.

Yoshimoto et al. (2007), said that andragogy is a concept of pedagogical approaches for adult learners in lifelong learning; however, it needs to be empirically investigated right now in higher education with regard to evaluation of educational outcomes. These are the only circumstances that can be properly referred to as andragogic or pedagogic, respectively, according to Yonge (1985). This does not lessen the value of autonomous learning, whether it be through formal or informal means. Both adults and children can benefit from and should value this kind of education. Nonetheless, the circumstance is not agogic (that is, neither andragogic nor pedagogic) unless one individual is escorting another. The heutagogical approach, on the other hand, lays a lot of emphasis on learner autonomy and the development of their capacity for self-directed learning. Using technology in the classroom can facilitate the integration of heutagogy, which will enhance student engagement and improve learning outcomes.

In this research the researchers proposed to analyze the preferred learning approach of Senior High School Students, as a basis for designing teachers' teaching style. The researchers came up with this study since Senior High students are in the transition years from being a young learner to young-adult learners. The researchers believed that there is a need for consultation among them for teachers to better prepare their lessons and if some adjustments

are needed. This research helped the students to be more motivated in learning using their preferred learning approaches, which is the primary reason for conducting such research.

Statement of the Problem :

This study aims to analyze the preferred learning approaches of Senior High School students as a basis for crafting the proposed teachers' teaching styles to be employed by teachers in the teaching-learning process.

Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. How may the preferred learning approaches of Senior High School students be described in terms of:

   1.1 dependence;

   1.2 resources for learning;

   1.3 reason for learning;

   1.4 focus of learning;

   1.5 motivation; and

   1.6 role of teacher?

2. What teachers' teaching styles may be proposed based on the findings of the study?

Methods :

This study utilized a descriptive quantitative research design which aims to analyze the preferred learning approach of Senior High School students as basis for crafting the proposed strategies to be employed by teachers in the teaching-learning process. The respondents of the study are the randomly selected Senior High School students from Grade 11 and Grade 12 levels enrolled during the SY 2022-2023 drawn using the fishbowl technique. A researcher-made survey questionnaire with the scale of (4) Very Much Preferred; (3) Much Preferred; (2) Somewhat Preferred and (1) Not Preferred was used to collect data. Permission from the official of the school to collect the data in Salapungan National High School was requested for the administration of the instrument to the respondents in the setting of the study. The questions in the questionnaire explained the preferred learning approach of the Senior High School students. After the data collection, statistical treatment of data followed using mean, frequency, and standard deviation.

Results

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Dependence
Table 1

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Dependence

Statement *I want my learning to be…*	Mean	Verbal Description	SD
1. dependent on what my teacher will say and prepare for me. *(Pedagogy)*	2.46	SP	21.90
2. independent by allowing me to strive for my autonomy and self-direction in learning	2.37	SP	17.90
3. based on my novel experience to manage my own learning.	2.31	SP	17.20

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very much preferred (VP); 2.50 – 3.24 Much preferred (MP); 1.75 – 2.49 Somewhat preferred (SP); 1.00 – 1.74 Not preferred (NP)

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Resources for Learning
Table 2

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Resources for Learning

Statement *I want to…*	Mean	Verbal Description	SD
1. to use resources made and prepared by the teachers like transmission techniques to store knowledge. *(Pedagogy)*	3.10	MP	19.80
2. use my own and other's day experiences in learning	2.56	MP	17.44
3. my teachers provide some resources, but I will have the chance to decide the path by negotiating the learning.	2.33	SP	17.80

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very much preferred (VP); 2.50 – 3.24 Much preferred (MP); 1.75 – 2.49 Somewhat preferred (SP); 1.00 – 1.74 Not preferred (NP)

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Reasons for Learning
Table 3

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Reasons for Learning

Statement *My reason for learning is…*	Mean	Verbal Description	SD
1. in order to advance to the next stage. *(Pedagogy)*	3.13	MP	20.16
2. to know or to perform effectively when they experienced a need	2.84	MP	19.18
3. not necessarily planned or linear learning is not necessarily based on need but on the identification of potential to learn in novel situation.	2.05	SP	18.11

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very much preferred (VP); 2.50 – 3.24 Much preferred (MP); 1.75 – 2.49 Somewhat preferred (SP); 1.00 – 1.74 Not preferred (NP)

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Focus of Learning
Table 4

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Focus of Learning

Statement *I want my…*	Mean	Verbal Description	SD
1. learning to be subject-centered, focused on prescribed curriculum and planned sequences according to the logic of the subject matter. *(Pedagogy)*	2.75	MP	18.63
2. learning as a task or problem centered.	2.02	SP	20.14
3. learning to be inquiry-driven, taking a long-term view of my learning, seeking further complexity and uncertainly.	1.99	SP	20.51

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very much preferred (VP); 2.50 – 3.24 Much preferred (MP); 1.75 – 2.49 Somewhat preferred (SP); 1.00 – 1.74 Not preferred (NP)

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Motivation
Table 5

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Motivation

Statement *My motivation to learn shall…*	Mean	Verbal Description	SD
1. come from external sources-usually parents, teachers, and a sense of competition.	2.83	SP	18.23
2. stems from internal sources-the increased of self-esteem, confidence and recognition come from successful performances.	3.15	MP	19.96
3. boost my self-esteem that comes from successfully completing a challenge. *(Andragogy)*	3.34	VP	22.94

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very much preferred (VP); 2.50 – 3.24 Much preferred (MP); 1.75 – 2.49 Somewhat preferred (SP); 1.00 – 1.74 Not preferred (NP)

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Role of the Teacher
Table 6

Preferred Learning Approach of Senior High School Students in terms of Role of the Teacher

Statement *I want my teacher to…*	Mean	Verbal Description	SD
1. design the learning process, imposes material, and assumed to know best. *(Pedagogy)*	3.26	VP	20.71
2. act as enablers or facilitator by maintaining a climate of collaboration, respect, and openness.	2.80	MP	18.92
3. set task but encourages diverse routes to solutions and pursues meta-cognition in learners.	2.39	SP	19.57

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Very much preferred (VP); 2.50 – 3.24 Much preferred (MP); 1.75 – 2.49 Somewhat preferred (SP); 1.00 – 1.74 Not preferred (NP)

4. Discussions :

This study analyzed the preferred learning approaches of Senior High school students in Salapungan Candaba, Pampanga during the S.Y. 2022-2023

Using the procedures described in the preceding chapters, the answers to the problems raised in this study were ascertained and summarized as follows:
With respect to the result, in the preferred learning approach in terms of dependence, item "I want my learning to be dependent on what my teacher will say and prepare for me, " got the highest mean of 2.46 with a verbal description of "Somewhat Preferred," which is under pedagogy approach.
This implies that the students are still dependent on teachers as manifested of the students' dependency on what their teachers will say and prepare for them.

Kirschener et, al. (2006) argues that experiential learning instruction is frequently given without direction, and they draw conclusions about the higher costs associated with PBL, lower basic science exam scores, longer study hours for PBL students, and multiple meta-analyses of the efficacy of problem-based learning.

As to the preferred learning approach of the students in terms of resources for learning, the item " I want to use resources made and prepared by the teachers like transmission technique to store knowledge" got the highest mean of 3.10 with a verbal interpretation of "Much Preferred, which is still belongs to pedagogical approach.

This implies that the students are still dependent to the teachers especially on the resources and instructional materials made and prepared by the teachers like transmission technique to store knowledge.

According to Ottenbreit-leftwich (2010), teachers are willing to integrate technological enhancement in their teaching-learning process because of their perceived benefits on the former. Teachers usage of ICT for teaching and learning was explored to measure their values and beliefs.

For the preferred learning approach in terms of reasons for learning, item " My reason for learning is in order to advance to the next stage," got the highest mean of 3.13, verbally described as " Much Preferred," which is categorically part of pedagogy approach.

This implies that the student's promotion to the next grade level remains the primordial reasons why they are studying.
According to Baker (2004), students' motivations for learning are impacted by the frequency and effects of various types of off-state behavior in the classroom.

In terms of focus of learning, the item " I want my learning to be more knowledgeable and more specific to understand" got the highest mean of 3.13, with a verbal description of " Much Preferred," and under pedagogy column.

This implies that the students wish their learnings to be more knowledgeable and more specific to understand, ordinarily, a characteristic of a student.

This is in line with the study of Pintrich (2002), claiming that there is a relationship existed between interest and previous knowledge. The study highlights the importance of studying interest. Understanding why comes not having some sort of super knowledge, but rather from just having more knowledge. It is believed that having more knowledge than having super knowledge contributes to the transition from knowing to understand and focus in learning.

Moreover, the learning approach preferred by students in terms of motivation identified that, item " My motivation to learn shall boost my self-esteem that comes from successfully completing challenge" got the highest mean of 3.14, verbally interpreted as "Very Much Preferred" belongs to andragogy.

This implies that through taking a risk, the students' motivation to learn becomes high especially when a task is completed.

Self-esteem stability is the degree to which an individual's current, and contextually based feelings of self-worth fluctuate for brief periods of time. Conversely, people's common, or typical, sense of self-worth is described by their levels of self-esteem. Their substantial body of research demonstrates that self-esteem stability out predicts self-esteem level. Additionally, considering self-esteem stability provides a way to distinguish between unhealthy and healthy forms of high self-esteem (Kernis, 2005).

Lastly, in terms of role of the teacher, the item "I want my teacher designs the learning process, imposes material, and assumed to know best" got the highest mean of 3.26 with VD of " Very Much Preferred, " which is still part of pedagogy.

This implies that the students' need of teacher's assistance and support is still hugely manifested.

Terada (2019), in keeping with the current study's observation of the teachers' long-term effects on students' academic performance. This unequivocally demonstrated that the teacher remains the most trustworthy figure in the classroom.

With respect to the findings, majority of the items falls under the "pedagogy" or teaching of children or dependent personalities (5 out of 6 items This all means that the students are still reliant to their teachers in terms of dependence, resources of learning, reasons in learning, focus of learning, motivation in learning, and role of the teacher.

Suggested Teaching Strategies based on the Results of the Study
The following are suggested teaching strategies to be employed by the teachers based on the results of the study:

- **Socratic Seminar**
  In Socratic seminar, the teacher poses a series of questions at the beginning to get the students to reflect critically on their knowledge and ignorance. Students usually learn more than they ever imagined possible, and instructors gain insight into how well their students have retained the course material. The process is very effective at identifying knowledge gaps and biases.

- **Question Formulation Technique**

  This teaching approach doesn't always look the same in all classrooms, but generally it follows the sequence of brainstorming questions, then improving them through a dialogue and repetition.

- **Tiered Learning Targets**

  The idea of this teaching strategy is to provide an accessible 'target for each student based on the same learning standard or objective. The lowest tier requires students to simply define a term based on their understanding. A tier up maybe to define it further and offer examples. A tier higher may be to analyze or evaluate the term in specific contexts, and so on.

- **Bloom's Twist**

  This is somewhat similar to tiered learning targets. This reminds me a little bit of tiered learning objectives. The idea is to design a task or lesson that starts at a lower cognitive level and "spirals" up, or "twists," by introducing increasingly difficult goals or objectives. Students who are "ready for more" can be challenged by this, and it can also help struggling students get some footing. In contrast to tier-based learning targets, also referred to as "objectives," there may be a wider range of complexity between lower and higher performance levels.

  The above-mentioned teaching strategies support the claim of the research, where the role of the teacher guides students to learn but crafting relevant instructional materials necessary in the teaching learning process. Alongside is to maintain that the students were challenged during the lesson to sustain their motivation toward learning

5. Conclusions :

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions was drawn:

Based on the significant findings, it is therefore concluded that "pedagogy" is still the most preferred learning approach of Senior High School students. The teacher still is the central figure in the classroom, expected to maneuver the flow of the teaching learning process by proving reliable instructional materials, maintaining classroom ambiance, sustaining students' motivation, and realizing other pertinent roles.

6. REFERENCES :

1. Baker, R. S., Corbett, A. T., Koedinger, K. R., & Wagner, A. Z. (2004l). Off-task behavior in the cognitive tutor classroom: When students" game the system". *In Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems* (pp. 383-390).

2. Bullock, I, Davis, M., Lockey, A., & Mackway-Jones, K. (Eds.). (2015). Pocket guide to teaching for clinical instructors. John Wiley & Sons.

3. Cakir, M. (2008) International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, v3 n4 p193-206

4. Davenport, J., & Davenport, J. A. (1985). A chronology and analysis of the andragogy debate. Adult education quarterly, 35(3), 152-159.

5. Forrest, S.P., III, & Peterson, T.O., It's called. Academy of management learning education, 5(1), 113-122.

6. Hall, R. L. (2020). Adult Learners' and Instructors' Perceptions of the Andragogical Instructional Method Used at Northern Mississippi Community College.

7. Haruna U. (2015). Difference between Pedagogical and Andragogical Methods of Teaching and the Preference of Andragogy for the Teaching of Adults. *International Journal of African and Asian Studies.*

8. Hedin, N. (2010). Experiential learning: Theory and challenges. *Christian education journal,* 7(1), 107-117.

9. Holt-Reynolds, D. (2000). What does the teacher do? Constructivist pedagogies and prospective teachers' beliefs about the role of a teacher. *Teaching and teacher education*, 16(1), 21-32.

10. Holton, E. F., Swanson, R. A., & Naquin, S. S. (2001). Andragogy in practice: Clarifying the andragogical model of adult learning. Performance improvement quarterly, 14(1), 118-143.

11. Hudson, G. A. (2005). A comparative analysis of the effects of pedagogical and andragogical instructional methods on academic performance of community college students. Delta State University.

12. Järvelä, S., & Niemivirta, M. (2001). Motivation in context: Challenges and possibilities in studying the role of motivation in new pedagogical cultures.

13. Kamansky, S. (2004). Comparing pedagogy and andragogy for both common and dissimilar meanings. University of Southern name. Website: http://www.Usm.Maine.Edu/~dlarson/kaminskv2.Htm.

14. Kernis, M. H. (2005). Measuring self-esteem in context: The importance of stability of self-esteem in psychological functioning. Journal of personality, 73(6), 1569-1605.

15. Kirshner, P., Sweller, J. and Clark, R. (2006). Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching Educational Psychologist, Vo. 41, No.2

16. Knowles, M. S. (1984). Theory of andragogy. NJIT Information Service and Technology. Website: https://web.njit.edu/~ronkowit/presentations/pages/andragogy.htm

17. Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., Swanson, R. A., SWANSON, R., & Robinson, P. A. (2020). The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development.

18. Korde, B. (2021). Pedagogy Vs Andragogy: Difference Between Pedagogy and Andragogy In Learning. Website: https://www.iitms.co.in/blog/difference-between-pedagogy-and-andragogy-in-learning.html

19. Marschall, S., & Davis, C. (2012). A conceptual framework for teaching critical reading to adult college students. *Adult learning*, 23(2), 63-68.

20. Margarete, G. (2020) Emerging technologies and pedagogies in the curriculum, 127-151

21. Marriam, S.B., Cafarella, R.S., & Baumgartner, L.M. (2007). Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide (3rd ed.).

22. Marshak, R. J. (1983). What's between pedagogy and andragogy? *Training & Development Journal*

23. Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Glazewski, K. D., Newby, T. J., & Ertmer, P. A. (2010). Teacher value beliefs associated with using technology: Addressing professional and student needs. Computers & education, 55(3), 1321-1335.

24. Pintrich, R. P. (2002). The Role of Metacognitive Knowledge in Learning, Teaching, and Assessing, Theory into Practice, 41:4, 219-225, DOI: 10.1207/s15430421tip4104_33 Off-task behavior in the cognitive tutor classroom: When students" game the system"

25. Rathner, J. A., & Schier, M. A. (2020). The impact of flipped classroom andragogy on student assessment performance and perception of learning experience in two advanced physiology subjects. *Advances in physiology education,* 44(1), 80-92.

26. Ryan, S. (2000). The virtual university: The internet and resource-based learning. Psychology Press.

27. Virginia, S. (2013), Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher, *Researching pedagogic tasks*, 119-140

28. Watson, R. (2015). Quantitative research. Nursing standard, 29(31).

29. White Jr, R. D. (2000). On Pedagogy and Andragogy: Balancing the learning needs of pre-service and in-service MPA students. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 6(2), 69-78.

30. Yoshimoto, K., Inenaga, Y., & Yamada, H (2007). Pedagogy and Andragogy in Higher Education? A Comparison between Germany, the UK and Japan. *European Journal of Education*, 42(1), 75–98.

31. Yonge, G. D. (1985). Andragogy and pedagogy: Two ways of accompaniment. *Adult education quarterly*, 35(3), 160-167.