

# Innovations

## Teachers' Productivity and Teaching Styles

<sup>1</sup>**Rhodora I. Dela Rosa**

Professor VI, Central Luzon State University, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>**Danilo S. Vargas**

Professor VI, Central Luzon State University, Philippines

Corresponding Author: **Danilo S. Vargas**

### Abstract:

**Issues:** The quality of pre-service training greatly depends upon the teachers who are properly prepared to undertake the various important roles and functions of the teaching profession. Indeed, the higher education system recognizes the two most essential factors of the teacher education enterprise – the teacher and the learner. **Methods:** Generally, this study aimed to analyze the attributes of teachers handling the College of Education degree courses (Bachelor in Elementary Education and Bachelor in Secondary Education). This study analyzed the teachers' productivity and teaching styles. There were 85 teacher – respondents who participated in the study. The Office of Admission, CLSU - Testing and Evaluation Center served as major data sources. The survey questionnaire was used to gather data on teachers' attributes. Descriptive statistics and t-tests were the statistical tools used in the study. **Findings:** Results revealed that the teacher–respondents' sex distribution was almost equal. Most of them were Assistant Professors and higher with 19.40 years as the mean length of teaching experience. The majority were members of professional organizations, however, they were found to have low-level research involvement and book development. The integrated method is the most used teaching procedure with "expert" as the prevailing teaching style. Findings revealed that there was no significant difference between the teaching styles of the various teachers who handled the general education, professional education, and specialization courses. **Conclusions:** The teachers handling the general education, professional education, and specialization courses of the College of Education have almost the same numbers of males and females, mostly Assistant Professors and higher, and have been teaching for ten years or more. They have been involved in professional organizations however found with a low level of research involvement and book development. They were more engaged with instructional materials development. They frequently used integrated methods with "experts" as the prevailing teaching style. No significant difference between the teaching styles of the various teachers who handled the general education, professional education, and specialization courses.

**Keywords:** 1. teachers', 2. productivity, 3. teaching styles, 4. research involvement, 5. book development

## 1. Introduction

CHED Memorandum Order No.30, series 2004 states that "quality pre-service teacher education is a key factor in quality Philippine education". The quality of pre-service training greatly depends upon the teachers who are properly prepared to undertake the various important roles and functions of the teaching profession. Indeed, the higher education system recognizes the two most essential factors of the teacher education enterprise – the teacher and the learner.

## 2. Objectives of the Study

Generally, this study aimed to analyze the attributes of teachers handling the College of Education degree courses (Bachelor in Elementary Education and Bachelor in Secondary Education).

Specifically, it sought to do the following:

- describe the teachers' personal and professional attributes in terms of sex, educational attainment, academic rank and length of teaching experience, and membership in professional organizations,
- determine the teacher's professional attributes such as productivity, teaching styles, teaching methods used, and teaching performance, respectively;
- determine the difference between the teaching styles of the respondents

## 3. Research Methodology

This study used a descriptive research design. The teacher – respondents of the study comprised all the teachers who handled the CLSU – College of Education general education courses, professional education courses, and specialization courses.

## 4. Data Used

Data regarding the teachers attributed were collected with the use of a survey questionnaire. The data regarding the teaching performance relative to students' evaluation was collected from the summary report submitted by each college/unit to the CLSU – Testing and Evaluation Center (CTEC).

5.Data analysis

Table 1. Teacher-respondents' attributes

	General Education (N=26) %		Professional Education (N=19) %		Specialization Courses (N=40) %		TOTAL N=85	%
<b>Sex</b>								
Female	16	61.54	8	42.11	17	42.50	<b>42</b>	<b>49.41</b>
Male	10	38.46	11	57.89	23	57.50	<b>43</b>	<b>50.59</b>

**Educational attainment**

BS	1	3.85	0	0	2	5.00	<b>3</b>	<b>3.53</b>
BS w/ MS/MA units	12	46.15	3	15.79	10	25.00	<b>25</b>	<b>29.41</b>
MS/MA	5	19.23	7	36.84	5	12.50	<b>17</b>	<b>20.00</b>
MS/MA w/PhD/EdDunits	5	19.23	3	15.79	9	22.50	<b>17</b>	<b>20.00</b>
Ph.D./EdD units	3	11.54	6	31.58	14	35.00	<b>23</b>	<b>27.06</b>

**Academic rank**

Instructor	14	53.85	8	42.11	7	17.50	<b>29</b>	<b>34.12</b>
Assistant Professor	5	19.23	4	21.05	9	22.50	<b>18</b>	<b>21.18</b>
Associate Professor	3	11.54	2	10.53	13	32.50	<b>18</b>	<b>21.18</b>

Professor4 15.385 26.3111 27.5020 **23.52**

**Length of teaching experience**

Below 10	11	42.31	5	26.32	5	12.50	21	24.71
10-19yrs.	8	30.77	7	36.84	12	30.00	27	31.76
20-29yrs.	3	11.54	2	10.53	15	37.50	20	23.53
30-& above	4	15.38	5	26.31	8	20.00	17	20.00
		$\bar{=14.80}$		$\bar{=19.00}$		$\bar{=22.55}$		

**Overall  $\bar{= 19.40}$ yrs.**

**SD = 11.24**

**Min. = 2 yrs.**

**Table 2. Teachers' productivity and membership in a professional organization**

	General Education (n=26)		Professional Education (n=19)		Specialization Courses (n=40)		All N=85	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Membership in a professional organization</b>								
With	16	61.54	16	84.21	33	82.50	65	76.47
Without	10	38.46	3	15.79	7	17.50	20	23.53
	<b>= 1.19</b>		<b>= 2.0</b>		<b>= 2.18</b>		<b>= 1.79</b>	
<b>Productivity</b>								
<b>a. research</b>								
With	7	26.92	11	57.89	15	37.50	33	38.82
Without	19	73.07	8	42.11	25	62.50	52	61.18
	<b>= 0.42</b>		<b>= 1.47</b>		<b>= 0.93</b>		<b>= 0.94</b>	
<b>b. instructional materials</b>								
With	12	46.15	14	73.68	22	55.00	48	56.47
Without	14	53.85	5	26.32	18	45.00	37	43.53
	<b>= 0.77</b>		<b>= 1.89</b>		<b>= 2.05</b>		<b>=1.57</b>	
<b>c. books</b>								
With	6	23.08	3	15.79	22	55.00	29	34.11
Without	22	84.62	16	84.21	18	45.00	56	65.88
	<b>= 0.42</b>		<b>= 0.36</b>		<b>=1.13</b>		<b>=0.64</b>	

**Table 3. The teaching methods of the teacher-respondents**

	<b>General Education</b>	<b>Descriptive rating</b>	<b>Professional Education</b>	<b>Descriptive rating</b>	<b>Specialization Courses</b>	<b>Descriptive rating</b>	<b>Overall Mean</b>	<b>Descriptive Rating</b>	<b>Overall Rank</b>
Lecture	3.88	Most of the times	3.84	Most of the times	4.33	Always	<b>4.08</b>	<b>Most of the times</b>	<b>2</b>
Reporting	2.38	Seldom	2.95	Some times	2.20	Seldom	<b>2.42</b>	<b>Seldom</b>	<b>14</b>
Demonstration	3.65	Most of the times	3.42	Most of the times	3.02	Some times	<b>3.31</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>6</b>
Self-Discovery Learning	2.92	Sometimes	3.16	Some times	3.45	Most of the times	<b>3.22</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>8</b>
Computer-Based Instruction	2.73	Sometimes	2.37	Seldom	2.27	Seldom	<b>2.44</b>	<b>Seldom</b>	<b>13</b>
Discussion	3.46	Most of the times	2.58	Seldom	2.92	Some times	<b>3.24</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>7</b>

Innovations, Number 70 September 2022

Inductive	3.42	Most of the times	4.00	Most of the times	3.50	Most of the times	<b>3.59</b>	<b>Most of the times</b>	<b>3</b>
Deductive	3.50	Most of the times	3.53	Most of the times	3.53	Most of the times	<b>3.52</b>	<b>Most of the times</b>	<b>4</b>
Activity Method	2.85	Sometimes	3.21	Sometimes	2.35	Seldom	<b>2.69</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>12</b>
Team Teaching	2.08	Seldom	2.47	Seldom	2.28	Seldom	<b>2.26</b>	<b>Seldom</b>	<b>15</b>
Problem-based learning	2.65	Sometimes	3.37	Sometimes	3.30	Sometimes	<b>3.12</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>9</b>
Experiential and hands-on method	3.30	Sometimes	3.74	Most of the times	3.40	Most of the times	<b>3.45</b>	<b>Most of the times</b>	<b>5</b>
Integrated method	4.26	Always	4.42	Always	4.10	Most of the times	<b>4.22</b>	<b>Always</b>	<b>1</b>
Group dynamics	3.30	Sometimes	3.37	Sometimes	2.38	Seldom	<b>2.88</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>11</b>
Project method	3.12	Sometimes	3.42	Most of the Times	2.63	Sometimes	<b>2.95</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>	<b>10</b>

**Legend:**

<b>4.2 – 5.0</b>	<b>Always</b>
<b>3.4 – 4.19</b>	<b>Most of the times</b>
<b>2.6 – 3.39</b>	<b>Sometimes</b>
<b>1.8 – 2.59</b>	<b>Seldom</b>
<b>1.0 – 1.79</b>	<b>Not at all</b>

**Table 4. The distribution of the teacher – respondents according to their teaching styles**

	General education		Professional Education		Specialization courses		All N=85	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
<b>Expert</b> (transmitter of information)	11	42.31	3	15.79	17	42.50	31	36.47
<b>Formal Authority</b> (sets standards and defines acceptable ways of doing things)	10	38.46	4	21.05	14	35.00	28	32.94
<b>Personal model or demonstrator</b> (teaches by illustration and direct example)	6	23.08	6	31.58	11	27.50	23	27.06
<b>Facilitator</b> (guides and directs by asking questions, exploring options, and suggesting alternatives)	4	15.38	5	26.32	8	20.00	17	20.00
<b>Delegator</b> (develops students' ability to function autonomously)	1	3.85	6	31.58	3	7.50	10	11.76
<b>Multiple</b> (with two or more prevailing teaching styles)	5	19.23	4	21.05	7	17.50	16	18.82

**Table 5. The teaching styles of the teacher-respondents**

	General Education	Descriptive rating	Professional Education	Descriptive rating	Specialization Courses	Descriptive rating	Overall Mean	Descriptive rating
<b>Expert</b> (transmitter of information)	4.28	Strongly Agree	4.33	Strongly Agree	4.42	Strongly Agree	<b>4.34</b>	Strongly Agree
<b>Formal Authority</b> (sets standards and defines acceptable ways of doing things)	4.22	Strongly Agree	4.17	Moderately agree	4.25	Strongly Agree	<b>4.21</b>	Strongly Agree
<b>Personal model or demonstrator</b> (teaches by illustration and direct example)	4.22	Strongly Agree	4.29	Strongly Agree	4.31	Strongly Agree	<b>4.28</b>	Strongly Agree
<b>Facilitator</b> (guides and directs by asking questions, exploring options, suggesting alternatives)	4.12	Moderately agree	4.41	Strongly Agree	4.22	Strongly Agree	<b>4.22</b>	Strongly Agree
<b>Delegator</b> (develops students' ability to function autonomously)	3.91	Moderately agree	4.30	Strongly Agree	3.97	Moderately agree	<b>4.01</b>	Moderately agree
<b>Multiple</b> (with two or more prevailing teaching styles)	3.97	Moderately agree	4.19	Moderately agree	4.0	Moderately agree	<b>4.05</b>	Moderately agree

**Legend:**

- 4.2 – 5.0**            **Strongly Agree**
- 3.4 – 4.19**        **Moderately agree**
- 2.6 – 3.39**        **Undecided**
- 1.8 – 2.59**        **Moderately disagree**
- 1.0 – 1.79**        **Strongly disagree**

**Table 6. One-way ANOVA on the teaching styles of the teacher-respondents**

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Expert</b>	Between Groups	24.853	2	12.427	1.287	.282
	Within Groups	791.900	82	9.657		
<b>Formal Authority</b>	Between Groups	5.598	2	2.799	.205	.815
	Within Groups	1117.696	82	13.63.		
<b>Personal Model</b>	Between Groups	12.111	2	6.055	.563	.572
	Within Groups	881.536	82	10.750		
<b>Facilitator</b>	Between Groups	52.464	2	26.232	1.853	.163
	Within Groups	1161.136	82	14.160		
<b>Delegator</b>	Between Groups	61.161	2	30.581	1.648	.199
	Within Groups	1521.827	82	18.559		
<b>Multiple/Combination</b>	Between Groups	54.023	2	25.123	1.345	.237
	Within Groups	1121.827	82	14.231		

**6. Conclusions**

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions are derived: The teachers handling the general education, professional education, and specialization courses of the College of Education have almost the same numbers of males and females, mostly Assistant Professors and higher, and have been teaching for ten years or more. They have been involved in professional organizations however found with a low level of research involvement and book development. They were more engaged with instructional materials development.

## References

1. Adams, C.M. and R.L. Pierce. (2004). *Characteristics of effective teaching*. Retrieved February 13, 2004, from ([www.bsu.edu](http://www.bsu.edu)).
2. Carlos, E.L. (1992). *Predictors of success in CPA board examination*. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
3. CHED Memorandum Order \* 30, Series 2004. *The new policies and standards on the teacher education curriculum*.
4. Chumrurn, C. (1999). *English instruction and students' performance at Rajamangalainstitute of technology in Thailand: an assessment*. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
5. Culberson, J.A., C. Henson, and R. Morrison. (1974). *Performance Objectives for School Principles Concepts and Instruments*. Berkeley, California: McCutchan.
6. De Gracia, R. (1999). *Performance of central and barangay elementary school teachers in division I of Pangasinan as influenced by selected variables*. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
7. Kamwendo, E. (2000). *Factors influencing faculty performance in selected private universities of region III, Philippines*. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
8. Kanchana, N. (2005). *Towards understanding the dimensions of teaching expertise for high schools in the Philippines*. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
9. Kowalski, T.J. (2003). *Contemporary school administration: an introduction*. 2nd edition. Publishers' Design and Production Services Inc.
10. Parungao, J.H. (2003). *Correlates academic achievement of third and fourth-year education students in CLSU, SY 2002-2003*. Unpublished master's thesis. CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
11. Patop. (1999). *Selected DECS-run public secondary school and SUC-run laboratory high schools in region III, Philippines: A performance analysis*. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, ScienceCity of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.
12. Quisumbing, L.R. (1999). *Towards sustainable quality in CHED-FAPE Graduate – Centers: An Assessment*
13. Ranjo, R.D. (1996). *Organizational Climate and Practices of Middle-Level Administrators in CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija*.
14. Republic Act\*7836. *An Act to strengthen the regulation and supervision of the practice of teaching in the Philippines and prescribing a licensure examination for teachers and other purposes*.
15. Rich, Y. (1993). *Stability and Change in teaching expertise, Teacher and Teaching Education*, 9, pp.137-146.
16. The role, V.E. (1997). *Determinants of science achievement of grade vi pupils in the district of Moncada south*. Unpublished master's thesis. Tarlac College of Agriculture, Camiling, Tarlac.
17. Salandanan, G.and B. Corpuz.( 2003). *Principles and Strategies of Teaching*. Adriana Printing Co., Inc. Quezon City.

18. *Virginia: Association for Wonchana, G. (2000). Parents and teachers' influence on values acquired by senior education students in the universities of Nueva Ecija, Philippines. Unpublished dissertation, CLSU, Science City of Muñoz, Nueva Ecija.*
19. *Zulueta, F.M. and K.L. Guimbatan. (2002). Teaching Strategies and Educational Alternatives. Volume II. Academic Publishing Corporation*