

# Teaching Styles of English Teachers and the English Proficiency of Grade V Pupils in Public Schools of Lanao Del Norte

**Jamelah P. Tataan**

Student  
Medina College  
Philippines

## **Abstract:**

This descriptive-correlational study with comparative components investigated the teaching styles of Grade V English teachers and the English proficiency of their pupils in selected public schools of Lanao del Norte. Thirty teachers, 891 pupils, and 30 administrators participated as respondents. Data were collected using a validated teaching styles questionnaire and a teacher-made English proficiency test covering vocabulary, reading comprehension, and language use. Teachers employed varied teaching styles across sensory modal orientations and learning parameters, with kinesthetic, visual-verbal, global, and group-oriented approaches being dominant in several schools. Pupils' overall English proficiency was at a satisfactory level, with vocabulary skills and language use showing variability across schools; one school achieved excellent performance. Pearson correlation analysis revealed significant relationships between pupils' English proficiency and specific teaching styles, notably auditory, global, individual, and group-oriented strategies, while teachers' personal and professional profiles showed no significant effect. Comparative analysis indicated differences in teaching styles across schools, suggesting context-specific adaptation by teachers to meet pupils' needs. These findings highlight the impact of teacher strategies on pupil learning outcomes and suggest that diversified, pupil-centered teaching styles can enhance English proficiency. The study underscores the importance of aligning instructional approaches with pupils' learning preferences to optimize language acquisition.

**Keywords:** Teaching styles, English proficiency, Grade V pupils, sensory modalities, learning parameters, public schools, Lanao del Norte.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Today's era marked the significance of asking for something that was not confusing or within the peripheral reach of a pupil's development. It was time to develop in our pupils the capacities to become creative and critical thinkers and lifelong learners; to be proficient in the art of communication, as well as in the use of the English language.

In the Philippines, it was admitted by well-meaning educators that there has been a marked deterioration in the quality of education, especially in the use of English, the official language of the country, adopted as the medium of instruction in classrooms. We leave no stone unturned in searching for ways and means by which we could remedy the situation and thereby sustain the so-called uphill battle of the English language. Truly, a good knowledge of the English language makes a great difference. Communication was vitally essential in achieving the varied goals of total living, not just in fulfilling those connected with the world of work. To participate meaningfully in the social, cultural, political, and other types of human activity, we must be able to speak, listen, write, and read effectively. To do this, we must learn a language and develop skills in using it.

Through language, social interaction was made possible. This was expressed by Isidro (2011) when he said: Language is the most significant instrument of social communication. It is through language, written or oral,

that our education is made possible. Its development parallels the growth of the child's ideas. Through language, man unites today his records, composes his songs, advances science, and enhances human progress. The same view on the social value of language was Bernardino's (2013) message when he said: As a vehicle in imparting one's idea, language is one of the primary requirements of a successful human being. It is unthinkable what kind of social life the mill would have if people were incapable of communicating effectively their meanings and ideas. No human activity can probably take place without man's ability to express his thoughts and to understand the thoughts that others wish to convey; whether at work or at play, in small or large groups, between individuals or between groups of persons, language serves as the medium for facilitating communication.

Our preparation for the world of work and for life in general was based to a large extent on the study of language and the development of language arts skills. Language, therefore, was a basic tool for communication, especially in the field of teaching. Learning/teaching any subject cannot be effectively advanced unless a person possesses the ability to think, speak, and write well in the language of instruction. In the Philippines, English was considered a second language, and as such, it has become an integral part of the curriculum. It was through this language that the formal schooling of the Filipino child was pursued from elementary through college. It was through this language that the Filipinos have achieved intellectual and social growth.

The importance of English, both for the teacher and the pupils, was underscored by Aquino (2012) when he said: It cannot be denied that a teacher cannot teach well and the pupils cannot learn effectively unless the teacher and the pupils have a proper command of the language of instruction. The deterioration of the quality of English is a concomitant of the general lowering of educational standards in our public and private schools. In so doing, English teaching has a role to play in the educational life of the individual and in the actual development of people. English was taught with varying degrees of emphasis in our schools; thus, listening, speaking, reading, and writing were parts of the curriculum. To study English is to learn it in such a way that it can be understood by the speakers of the language. The development of reading ability in English with increased comprehension skills must be given greater emphasis. Moreover, it has often been said that language was man's greatest invention and most valuable possession. There were, certainly, a few thinking people who would disagree.

The problem of reading comprehension was compounded when children read materials that were not in their native tongue, as in the case of Filipino children trying to read English texts. Because of the different cultural backgrounds of Filipinos, schools needed to provide language programs to ensure that all pupils develop the level of proficiency in English required for success in school and in the workplace. Although some pupils were proficient in English, many with little or no previous experience with English have to develop literary skills in the second language.

Pupils could build a better society based on social and economic change. If physicians could cure more people and engineers could build better machines, then schools could teach better. If an engineer has a blueprint before he can construct a building or a bridge, a teacher, too, has a lesson plan to make his or her teaching systematic and effective. It bridged the learning skills of the learners. Hence, as teachers, we must select strategies to be utilized in the classroom to make sure teaching takes place, and the pupils' level of proficiency is increased, particularly in the English language.

Learning is a continuous process that takes place from the early years of the child's development and continues throughout his lifetime. Knowledge of the interests, needs, and growth patterns of the individual was important.

Knowing this, it was imperative that teachers have a knowledge of these processes in order to help them detect the weaknesses and advancement of pupils in the English field. The efficient teacher should be able to help children to the fullest so that these children may experience enjoyment or even fulfilment in their lives. They should be fully equipped with the kind of tools they need, and children should not be left to shun the normal

activities of growing learners, thus affecting their personality as having some sort of imbalanced tendencies and perhaps, in the end, may become social misfits.

Time and again, writers have emphasized the importance of upgrading the teaching of English because if it were taught effectively, then the pupils' learning or acquisition of skills in the other learning areas could become easier and faster. Consequently, the success of language learning and the acquisition of basic and higher-level language skills depended largely on both the teacher and the learners. A teacher has to possess an effective teaching style so that the pupils can eventually achieve proficiency in the English language. This study described and compared the teaching styles of selected Grade V English language teachers in the public schools in selected districts in Lanao del Norte Division. It took into account some personal/professional factors that may have a direct bearing on their teaching styles. Data for this study were based on the responses of selected Grade V English language teachers and the evaluation made by the pupils, school heads, and the English teachers' self-evaluation of their approaches, methods, and techniques in the language classroom.

### Statement of the Problem

This study sought to determine the teaching styles of Grade V English language teachers in public schools of Lanao del Norte. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the Grade V English language teachers in terms of the following personal/professional factors:
  - 1.1 gender;
  - 1.2 age;
  - 1.3 civil status;
  - 1.4 highest educational attainment;
  - 1.5 number of years in teaching English;
  - 1.6 area of specialization;
  - 1.7 academic rank; and
  - 1.8 English seminars/trainings attended?
  
2. What is the teaching styles profile of the English language teachers in selected schools in Kolambugan District, Lanao del Norte in terms of:
  - 2.1 Learning Parameters
    - 2.1.1 global vs analytic
    - 2.1.2 reflective vs. impulsive, and
    - 2.1.3 individual vs group oriented?
  - 2.2 Sensory Modal Orientations
    - 2.2.1 visual-verbal;
    - 2.2.2 visual non-verbal;
    - 2.2.3 auditory; and
    - 2.2.4 kinesthetic?
  
3. What is the level of proficiency of Grade V pupils in the different schools in terms of:
  - 3.1 vocabulary skills,
  - 3.2 reading comprehension, and
  - 3.3 language use?
  
4. Is there a significant relationship between teachers' personal/professional factors and pupils' English Proficiency?
5. Is there a significant relationship between teaching styles and pupils' English Proficiency?
6. Is there a significant relationship between teaching styles and personal/professional profile of the Grade V English Teachers?
7. Are these significant differences in the teaching styles of the Grade V English language teacher in the different schools?

## Hypotheses

Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the teaching styles of language teachers and the pupils' proficiency in the English language.

Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between the teachers' personal/professional factors and the pupils' proficiency in the English language.

Ho<sub>3</sub>: There are no significant differences in the teaching styles of English language teachers in the different schools.

## METHODS

### Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational research design with comparative components because it aimed to describe the teachers' profile, teaching styles, and pupils' English proficiency, as well as to determine the relationships among these variables and examine differences in teaching styles across schools. The descriptive aspect was used to present the profile of teachers, their teaching styles, and the pupils' level of English proficiency; the correlational component was applied to determine the relationships between teachers' profiles, teaching styles, and pupils' English proficiency; and the comparative component was utilized to identify significant differences in teaching styles of teachers across different schools.

### Research Settings

This study was conducted in selected public elementary schools of Lanao del Norte, Philippines. The schools were chosen to represent diverse teaching environments and pupil populations within the division. Data were collected from Grade V classrooms, including English teachers, their pupils, and school administrators. The classrooms varied in terms of student population, available learning resources, and instructional practices, providing a representative context for examining the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and pupils' English proficiency.

### Research Respondents

The study involved three groups of evaluators from selected Grade V English teachers and classes in the public schools. It made use of 30 English language Grade V teachers, and their classes totaled 891 pupils. The administrators from the selected schools were asked to evaluate their language teachers based on the strategies and techniques they employed in this class.

**Table 1 - Respondents of the Study**

Categories	Frequency	Percent
Teachers	30	3.15
Pupils	891	93.70
Administrators	30	3.15
<b>Total</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>100.00</b>

### Research Instrument

The researcher made use of a questionnaire, which was formulated and administered by Mariani in 2007.

However, the researcher made some additional items in the questionnaire for the teachers. Part One covered their personal/professional factors. Part Two mentioned the different teaching styles of English language teachers.

The teaching styles questionnaire helped the teacher think about their teaching style in the areas of sensory modalities, namely: visual-verbal, visual-non-verbal, auditory, and kinesthetic, and learning parameters such as global vs analytic orientation, degree of structure, and individual vs group orientation. The respondents were requested to mark the frequency of the behaviour or strategy under the columns Always or Nearly Always, Often, Sometimes, or Rarely or Never.

There were five (5) items each for Global vs Analytic Orientation, seven (7) items each for Reflective vs Impulsive Orientation, and three (3) items each for Individual vs Group Orientation.

The data gathering instrument used in determining the pupils' proficiency in the English language was a teacher-made test. The test measured vocabulary skills, reading comprehension, and language use. The test consisted of multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blanks, enumeration, and identification type. It was administered to 891 Grade V pupils in the selected public schools. This was made by the researcher and had its trial testing in schools that were not included in the study.

The validation of the said instrument was accomplished using the following procedure. First, a 50-item test was administered to 63 Grade V pupils in Tubod Central School. Results were subjected to item analysis, where indices of difficulty and discrimination were computed.

In determining whether the test was retained or eliminated, the following norms were used as a basis:

Retain: Difficulty Index = 0.21 – 0.79

Discrimination Index = 0.40 - above

Eliminate: Difficulty Index = negative and nearly zero

Discrimination Index = higher than 0.80 and lower than 0.20

Revise: Discrimination Index = 0.20-0.39

For the item with a difficulty index of above 0.80, it meant that it was very easy while the item below 0.20 difficulty index and discrimination index means that it was very difficult. Based on the table of Specifications and the results of the item analysis, the test was revised. Only 40 items were included in the revised version. Some item that had inadequate difficulty and discrimination indices were retained but revised to meet the specified item distribution per topic.

The 40-item was again tried out to 25 Grade V pupils of Kolambugan Central School and it was subjected to validation by a Head Teacher, Master of Arts in Teaching English, District Supervisor, and the English Supervisor in the division. The validators were requested to accomplish a validation questionnaire.

They rated in terms of adequacy the conceptual learning objective, appropriateness for the comprehension clarity, and appropriateness for the vocabulary level of Grade V pupils. The questionnaire used the following scale: 5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Undecided, 2-Disagree, and 1-Strongly Disagree. The mean rating given by the three evaluators was 4.44 which indicated that the test was valid.

### Data Gathering Procedure

In obtaining the data needed in the study, the researcher first sought permission and approval from the Schools Division Superintendents of the Divisions of Lanao del Norte, also from the District Supervisor of Division in gathering and administering questionnaires and English Proficiency Test. Moreover, final coordination and permission was sought from the administrators of the school respondents of the study where the researcher personally distributed and retrieved such questionnaire.

### Scoring Procedure

The English Proficiency Test was administered in six days for 40 minutes only in each class. The researcher herself administered the test to the respondents.

Below was the norm used for the interpretation of the items:

#### Vocabulary Skills

Range of Scores	Interpretation
5.60-7.00	Excellent (E)
4.20-5.59	Very Satisfactory (VS)
2.80-4.19	Satisfactory (S)
1.40-2.79	Fair (F)

0-1.39	Poor (P)
<b>Reading Comprehension</b>	
Range of Scores	Interpretation
12.00 – 15.00	Excellent (E)
9.00 – 11.99	Very Satisfactory (VS)
6.00 – 8.99	Satisfactory (S)
3.00 – 5.99	Fair (F)
0 – 2.99	Poor (P)
<b>Language Use</b>	
Range of Scores	Interpretation
14.40 – 18.00	Excellent (E)
10.80 – 14.39	Very Satisfactory (VS)
7.20 – 10.79	Satisfactory (S)
3.60 – 7.19	Fair (F)
0 – 3.59	Poor (P)
<b>Overall Proficiency</b>	
Range of Scores	Interpretation
32.00 – 40.00	Excellent (E)
24.00 – 31.99	Very Satisfactory (VS)
16.00 – 23.99	Satisfactory (S)
8.00 – 15.99	Fair (F)
0 – 7.99	Poor (P)

### Statistical Treatment of Data

The following statistical tools were employed to analyze and interpret the data gathered in the study:

**Frequency and Percentage.** These were used to determine the profile of the Grade V English language teachers in terms of gender, age, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years in teaching English, area of specialization, academic rank, and number of seminars/trainings attended.

**Mean.** The mean was utilized to determine the level of teaching styles of the English language teachers based on the responses of the three groups of respondents, as well as to assess the level of English proficiency of Grade V pupils in terms of vocabulary skills, reading comprehension, and language use. It was also used to identify the dominant teaching styles of the teachers, where higher mean scores indicated a higher level of preference for a particular teaching style.

**Scoring and Scaling Technique.** A four-point Likert scale was employed to quantify the respondents' perceptions of teaching styles, with the following assigned values: 4 – Always or Nearly Always, 3 – Often, 2 – Sometimes, and 1 – Rarely or Never. The obtained mean scores were interpreted using the adopted scale from Mailed (2011) to classify teaching styles as high or low level across learning parameters and sensory modal orientations.

**Table 2 - Mean Scores for the Levels of the Different Teaching Styles**

Teaching Styles	High Level	Low Level
Global vs. Analytic	11–20	1–10
Reflective vs. Impulsive	15–28	1–14
Individual vs. Group Orientation	7–12	1–6
Sensory Modal Orientations	9–16	1–8

**Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r).** This was used to determine the significant relationships between teachers' personal/professional profile and pupils' English proficiency, between teaching styles and pupils' English proficiency, and between teaching styles and teachers' profile.

**Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).** This was employed to determine whether there were significant differences in the teaching styles of Grade V English language teachers across different schools, as well as to examine whether the assessments of the three groups of respondents (teachers, pupils, and administrators) significantly differed.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Problem 1. What is the profile of the Grade V English language teachers in terms of the following personal/professional factors: gender, age, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years in teaching English, area of specialization, academic rank, and English seminars/trainings attended?

**Table 3 - Profile of the Grade V English Language Teachers in 7 Central Public Schools**

Variables	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		Overall	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Gender																
Male	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Female	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100
Age																
50-59	1	25	1	33.3	-	-	3	75	3	33.3	2	50	-	-	10	33.5
40-49	-	-	2	66.6	1	33.3	-	-	3	33.3	1	25	1	33.3	8	26.9
30-39	3	75	-	-	1	33.3	1	25	3	33.3	1	25	2	66.6	11	36.6
20-29	-	-	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	33.3
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	
Civil Status																
Single	2	50	1	33.3	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	1	33.3	5	16.6
Married	2	50	2	66.6	3	100	4	100	7	77.7	4	100	2	66.6	24	80
Widow/er	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	1	3.4
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100
Educational Attainment																
Doctoral Degree	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	25	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	4	13.3
Master's Degree	1	25	2	66.6	3	100	3	75	7	77.7	4	100	2	66.6	22	73.4
Bachelor's Degree w/ MA units	3	75	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	33.3	4	13.3
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100
No. of Yrs. In Teaching English																
21 and above	1	25	2	66.6	1	33.3	3	75	4	44.4	1	25	-	-	12	38.8
16-20 yrs.	-	-	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	33.3	2	6.9
11-15 yrs.	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	-	-	1	33.3	5	16.9
6-10 yrs.	2	50	-	-	1	33.3	1	25	-	-	2	50	1	33.3	7	23.9
0-5 yrs.	1	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	22.2	1	25	-	-	4	13.6
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100

Area of Specialization																	
English	1	25	2	66.6	2	66.6	3	75	2	22.2	2	50	2	66.6	14	46.6	
Soc. Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	1	3.4	
Science	1	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3.4	
T.H.E.	1	25	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	3	100	
Filipino	1	25	-	-	-	-	1	25	2	22.2	1	25.0	1	33.3	6	20	
PEHM	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	2	6.6	
Math	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	22.2	1	25	-	-	3	10	
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100	
Academic Rank																	
T1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	33.3	3	75	-	-	6	20	
T2	2	50	-	-	3	100	1	25	2	22.2	-	-	1	3.33	9	30	
T3	1	25	2	66.6	-	-	1	25	-	-	-	-	2	66.6	6	20	
MT 1	1	25	-	66.6	-	-	1	25	2	22.2	1	25	-	-	5	16.6	
MT 2	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	25	2	22.2	-	-	-	-	4	13.4	
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100	
No. of Seminars/ Trainings Attended																	
1-3	2	50	-	-	-	-	1	25	4	44.4	1	25	-	-	8	26.7	
4-6	1	25	-	-	1	33.3	1	25	1	11.1	1	25	1	33.3	6	20	
7-9	-	-	-	-	1	33.3	-	-	1	11.1	-	-	-	-	2	6.7	
10 or more	1	25	3	100	1	33.3	2	50	3	33.3	2	50	2	66.6	14	46.6	
Total	4	100	3	100	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100	30	100	

Table 3 presented the personal/professional profile of the English language teachers in the selected public central schools in Lanao del Norte Division namely: gender, age, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years in teaching, area of specialization, academic rank, number of trainings/seminars attended.

All of the 30 teachers or 100% were female. This showed that in the seven districts, female teachers were assigned to teach the English language, the fact that male teachers were very few and were usually assigned as shop teachers, Practical Arts, or Industrial Arts teachers.

Eleven (11 or 36.6%) teachers belonged to the 30 – 39 age brackets, 10 belonged to 50 – 59 (33.5%) while only one (3%) belonged to the 20 – 29 age brackets. These meant that almost all the teachers were matured and have enough experience in teaching the English language. They were considered psychologically and emotionally matured. So, they can easily conflict that arise in their classes, and handle the discipline of the pupils.

Twenty-four (24 or 80%) were married; only five (16.6%) were single. Though married teachers have more responsibilities to attend to, they can still manage to come up with varied activities as to enrich their English lessons.

Of the 30 teachers, 22 (73.3%) have Master's Degree; four (13.3%) have Doctoral Degree and four (13.3%) have M.A units. These teachers have grown professionally; they were more skilled and knowledgeable than those who haven't earned any unit in the graduate program.

Twelve (12 or 40%) have 21 and above years in teaching English; two (6.6%) have 16 – 20 years; five (16.6%) have 11 – 15 years; seven (23.6%) 6 – 10 years; and four (13.3%) have 0 -5 years in experience. As stated by

Dela Cruz (2014), the more experienced a teacher has, the more effective she was in meeting individual needs and differences.

Fourteen (14 or 46.6%) teachers specialized in English while 16 (53.4%) were non-English majors. As cited by Thommawong (2013), administrators should try to consider teachers' interest, special skills, special training undergone, and work-related experience in the distribution of teaching loads.

Nine (9 or 30%) were Teacher II; six (20%) Teacher III; five (16.6%) Master Teacher I; and four (13.3%) Master Teacher II. Master Teachers performed better than those with lower rank because they had more accomplishments and they had more exposure to varied teaching-learning situations.

Fourteen (14 or 46.6%) had participated in 10 or more trainings/seminars in English. Only two (6.6%) have 7 – 9 trainings/seminars. These teachers had gained more knowledge and insights about the new methods, strategies, and techniques in teaching in English language.

**Table 4 - Evaluation of the Three Groups of Respondents in the Central Public Central School in Terms of Sensory Modal Orientations**

Central Schools	Teaching Style	Teachers	Administrators	Pupils	Ave.	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	DR
A	Visual Verbal	12.00	12.20	12.98	12.39	High
	Non-Verbal	10.25	12.20	9.64	10.69	High
	Auditory	10.75	11.20	10.74	10.89	High
	Kinesthetic	12.50	11.00	10.89	11.46	High
B	Visual Verbal	13.33	11.00	13.19	12.50	High
	Non-verbal	11.00	11.00	9.61	10.53	High
	Auditory	11.33	11.00	11.21	11.18	High
	Kinesthetic	13.00	12.66	10.54	12.06	High
C	Visual Verbal	13.00	13.66	13.20	13.28	High
	Non-Verbal	10.33	13.66	9.53	11.17	High
	Auditory	13.33	12.33	11.18	12.28	High
	Kinesthetic	10.06	14.33	9.88	11.62	High
D	Visual Verbal	11.25	13.42	13.32	12.66	High
	Non-verbal	10.00	13.42	10.78	11.40	High
	Auditory	11.50	12.42	11.25	11.72	High
	Kinesthetic	14.00	13.71	10.95	12.88	High
E	Visual Verbal	13.22	13.60	11.96	12.92	High
	Non-verbal	10.33	13.60	9.17	11.03	High
	Auditory	11.44	11.40	10.61	11.15	High
	Kinesthetic	12.33	11.20	9.87	11.13	High
F	Visual Verbal	14.50	12.25	13.66	13.47	High
	Non-verbal	10.00	12.25	10.48	11.24	High
	Auditory	12.00	11.75	12.27	12.00	High
	Kinesthetic	13.25	13.25	12.96	13.15	High
G	Visual Verbal	12.66	14.66	12.49	13.47	High
	Non-verbal	10.66	14.66	9.82	11.66	High
	Auditory	11.33	12.00	11.98	11.77	High
	Kinesthetic	13.00	13.00	11.94	12.64	High

The teachers in the seven central schools obtained an average mean rating of 10.80 – 13.72 with a descriptive rating of high. This result showed that the English teachers were high in Visual Verbal, Visual Non-Verbal,

Auditory, and Kinesthetic. Similarly, the administrators' and pupils' evaluations conform to the teachers' evaluations.

**Table 5** - Evaluation of the Three Groups of Respondents in the Public Central Schools in Terms of Learning Parameters

Central Schools	Teaching Style	Teachers	Administrators	Pupils	Ave.	
		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	DR
A	Global	14.20	15.00	11.48	13.56	High
	Analytic	14.75	15.00	13.86	14.53	High
	Reflective	21.00	21.40	20.40	20.93	High
	Impulsive	22.25	22.60	20.76	21.87	High
	Individual	8.50	7.40	6.84	7.58	High
	Group Oriented	9.25	9.40	9.10	9.25	High
B	Global	15.33	13.66	11.62	13.53	High
	Analytic	15.00	14.00	14.31	14.43	High
	Reflective	22.33	20.33	20.30	20.98	High
	Impulsive	22.00	22.33	20.63	21.65	High
	Individual	6.33	6.66	7.07	6.68	High
	Group Oriented	10.00	9.00	8.62	9.20	High
C	Global	14.33	15.66	11.15	13.71	High
	Analytic	15.00	17.33	14.00	15.44	High
	Reflective	20.66	24.00	19.61	21.42	High
	Impulsive	23.33	22.66	21.23	22.40	High
	Individual	8.00	9.00	6.80	7.93	High
	Group Oriented	9.00	10.66	8.43	9.36	High
D	Global	18.25	17.00	12.27	15.84	High
	Analytic	17.50	17.00	14.80	16.43	High
	Reflective	24.25	23.70	21.14	23.03	High
	Impulsive	23.00	22.71	20.62	22.11	High
	Individual	8.00	7.80	7.02	7.60	High
	Group Oriented	11.75	10.85	9.26	10.62	High
E	Global	15.33	15.00	10.77	13.70	High
	Analytic	16.33	15.00	13.60	14.97	High
	Reflective	22.00	20.00	19.15	20.38	High
	Impulsive	22.66	22.8	20.83	22.09	High
	Individual	7.44	7.40	6.85	7.23	High
	Group Oriented	10.00	9.80	8.55	9.45	High
F	Global	18.25	18.25	13.30	16.40	High
	Analytic	15.50	15.50	15.69	15.56	High
	Reflective	23.00	23.00	20.42	22.14	High
	Impulsive	22.25	22.25	20.15	21.55	High
	Individual	9.25	7.85	7.70	8.26	High
	Group Oriented	11.50	11.50	10.26	11.08	High
G	Global	17.00	17.00	12.75	15.58	High

	Analytic	17.00	17.00	15.77	16.59	High
	Reflective	19.00	19.00	21.55	19.85	High
	Impulsive	23.00	23.00	20.23	22.07	High
	Individual	7.66	9.25	7.57	8.16	High
	Group Oriented	10.00	10.00	9.57	9.85	High

This showed that the English language teachers in the seven central schools were high in global, analytic, reflective, impulsive, and group-oriented style of teaching, and low individual teaching style. The administrators and pupils’ evaluation conformed to the teachers’ evaluation. The activities given did not require pupils to work independently. Thus, they were not motivated by intrinsic and self-defined rewards.

**Table 6 - Teaching Styles Profile of the Grade V English Language Teachers in the Public Schools**

Variables	A		B		C		D		E		F		G	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sensory Modal Orientations:														
Visual Verbal	1	25	1	33	2	67	1	25	6	67	1	25	2	67
Visual Non-Verbal	-	-	1	33	-	-	-	-	1	11	-	-	-	-
Auditory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kinesthetic	3	75	1	33	1	33	3	75	2	22	3	75	1	33
Learning Parameters:														
Global	2	50	2	67	2	67	3	75	3	33	4	100	1	33
Analytic	2	50	1	33	1	33	1	25	6	67	-	-	2	67
Reflective	1	25	1	33	-	-	3	75	3	33	2	50	-	-
Impulsive	3	75	2	67	3	100	1	25	6	67	2	50	3	100
Individual	1	25	-	-	-	-	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Group Oriented	3	75	3	67	3	100	4	100	9	100	4	100	3	100

The table showed that in sensory model orientations and in learning parameters, teachers did not use only one teaching style. They used varied teaching styles in their English classes to meet the needs of their pupils and to increase their level of proficiency. Under sensory modal orientations, Kinesthetic was the dominant teaching style used by three (75%) of the four teachers in School A. In this style, teachers let their pupils recall their experiments, and role-playing. One (25%) used Visual Verbal. This teacher makes pupils recalled what they saw, allowed pupils to explain, follow written or drawn instructions, used objects and pictures. In terms of learning parameters, two (50%) of them were global. In this teaching style, the teachers encouraged learners to focus on meaning and fluency; collect examples of language used rather than form rules. While the other two (50) of them were global. In this teaching style, the teachers encouraged learners to focus on meaning and fluency, collected examples of language use rather than form rules. While the other two (50%) were analytic, they encouraged learners to make decisions based on logical and common sense, plan and organize well and focus details and facts. There was no dominant teaching style in School B in terms of sensory modal orientations. One teacher (33%) was Visual Verbal; one (33%) was Visual Non-Verbal; one (33%) was Kinesthetic. In terms of learning parameters, three (100%) were Group-Oriented. Two (67%) of them were Global while one (33%) was Analytic. In School C, 67% of the teachers used Visual Verbal sensory modal orientation. All of the three districts (100%) of the teachers were Reflective and Group-Oriented. Kinesthetic was the dominant sensory modal orientation (3 or 75%). In School D, the four teachers (100%) were Group Oriented but three (75%) of them were Analytic and at the same time Reflective. In School E, six (67%) of the teachers used Visual Verbal sensory modal orientation. Nine (100%) were Group-Oriented-the dominant learning parameter. Six (67%) of them were Impulsive and Analytic. In School F, three (75%) was the dominant sensory modal orientation whereas Global, equipped Group-Oriented four (100%) used these learning parameters. And in School G, two (67%) out of three were Visual Verbal. All the three (100%) are Impulsive and Group-Oriented at the same time. These were then considered as the dominant learning

parameters. As a whole, it was concluded that no teacher in the seven central schools used only one particular teaching style.

**Table 7 - Mean Scores for the English Language Proficiency Test of Grade V Pupils in the Public Schools**

Districts	No. of Pupils	Vocabulary Skills		Reading Comprehension		Language Use		Overall	
		X	DR	X	DR	X	DR	X	DR
A	119	2.46	F	7.14	S	7.01	F	16.63	S
B	91	2.53	F	5.42	F	4.95	F	12.86	F
C	60	3.76	S	5.68	F	6.63	F	14.96	F
D	142	3.03	S	7.51	S	7.6	F	18.12	S
E	241	2.82	S	8.09	S	8.26	S	19.41	S
F	120	5.83	VS	11.95	VS	12.32	VS	32.00	E
G	118	4.97	VS	9.33	VS	10.02	S	24.72	VS
<b>Overall</b>	<b>891</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>7.87</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>8.11</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>19.81</b>	<b>S</b>

On Vocabulary Skills. In Vocabulary skills, School F pupils obtained very satisfactory level ( $x=5.83$ ). Those in School G also achieved very satisfactory level ( $x=4.97$ ), while School A and B obtained fair level ( $x=2.46$ ) and ( $x=2.53$ ) respectively. As a whole, in terms of vocabulary skills, the pupils obtained a satisfactory level ( $x=3.54$ ). This meant that the pupils were good in understanding the meaning through affixes, compound words, and in deriving meaning through context.

On Reading Comprehension. In terms of reading comprehension, the pupils of School F and School G got a very satisfactory level ( $x=11.95$ ) and ( $x=9.33$ ), while those in School B and C obtained only a rating of fair ( $x=5.42$ ) and ( $x=5.68$ ). As a whole, Central Schools involved in the study had a satisfactory level ( $x=7.87$ ). The result showed that the pupils were good in predicting outcomes, recognizing the main idea, transcoding information from a table, structural analysis, and noting details.

On Language Use. In terms of language use, School F pupils obtained very satisfactory level ( $x=12.32$ ), while those in the three central schools and School D got fair, School B had the lowest mean ( $x=4.95$ ). In general, pupils had a satisfactory level ( $x=8.11$ ). This manifestation that the pupils in the seven central schools were good in spelling, they know the rules in forming the plural of nouns, correct usage, subject-verb agreement, identifying the parts of speech, and structure and written expression.

Table 7 also showed the summary of the level of English Proficiency of the Grade V pupils in the central public schools in Lanao del Norte. Among the seven Central Schools, School F had the highest rating, excellent ( $x=32.00$ ), while School A and C obtained only fair level ( $x=12.86$ ) and ( $14.96$ ) respectively. This was a manifestation that School F performed excellently in vocabulary skills, reading comprehension, and language use.

**Table 8 - Relationship Between Personal/Professional of Grade V English Language Teachers and Pupils' English Proficiency**

Personal/ Professional Profile	Vocabulary Skills	Reading Comprehension	Language Use	Overall
Age	-0.10	0.06	0.00	0.02
Civil Status	0.24	0.25	0.27	0.26
Educational Attainment	0.16	0.12	0.15	0.13
No. of yrs in Teaching English	-0.30	-0.30	-0.30	-0.30
Area of Specialization	-0.02	0.07	0.04	0.04
Academic Rank	-0.33	-0.24	-0.28	-0.27

No. of English Trainings/Seminars Attended	0.10	-0.06	-0.06	-0.02
--	------	-------	-------	-------

The table showed that the pupils' proficiency has no significant relationship with the personal/professional factors. This meant that a pupil can still achieve a good performance in English language regardless of gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, number of years in teaching English, area of specialization, academic rank, and number of English trainings/seminars attended by the teacher.

**Table 9 - Relationship Between Pupils' Proficiency and Teaching Styles of Grade V English Language Teachers**

Teaching Styles	Vocabulary Skills	Reading Comprehension	Language Use	Overall
Sensory Modal Orientations				
Visual Verbal	0.28	0.19	0.18	0.22
Visual Non-Verbal	-0.07	0.04	0.03	0.02
Auditory	0.40*	0.38*	0.38*	0.40*
Kinesthetic	0.04	0.21	0.16	0.18
Learning Parameters				
Global	0.36	0.47**	0.46*	0.46*
Analytic	0.02	0.12	0.12	0.09
Reflective	-0.07	0.08	0.04	0.05
Impulsive	0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.02
Individual	0.32	0.40	0.41*	0.13
Group-Oriented	0.23	0.42*	0.39	0.39

The table clearly showed that Auditory teaching style was significantly related to Vocabulary (0.40\*), Reading Comprehension (0.38\*) and Language Use (0.38\*). This was an implication that pupils can easily recall what they heard, follow spoken instructions, and learn by listening and speaking. Global was significantly related to Reading Comprehension (0.47\*) and Language use (0.46\*).

It was a manifestation that pupils were encouraged to focus on meaning and fluency, collect of language use rather than form of rules, produce an oral or written text. Also, Individual was significantly related to language use (0.41\*). In his teaching style, the activities required the pupils to work independently to be motivated through intrinsic and self-defined awards. Group-oriented has significant relationship to reading comprehension (0.42\*). This showed that the activities given to the pupils required them to be more dependent on group or an external authority to define their identity or role.

**Table 10 - Correlation Coefficients Between Teaching Styles and Personal Profile of the Grade V English Language Teachers in the Public Schools**

Personal/ Prof. Factors	Teaching Styles									
	Visual Verbal	Visual Non-Verbal	Auditory	Kinesthetic	Global	Analytic	Reflective	Impulsive	Individual	Group
Age	0.04	0.25	0.15	-0.12	0.11	-0.24	-0.15	0.37*	-0.17	0.04
Civil Status	0.17	0.54**	0.35	0.47**	0.07	0.14	0.13	0.04	0.33	0.10

Educational Attainment	-0.18	0.00	-0.29	-0.15	-0.05	-0.23	-0.34	0.13	0.11	-0.24
No. of Yrs in Teaching English	-0.07	0.14	0.10	-0.06	0.17	-0.16	-0.05	-0.24	-0.41*	-0.07
Area of Specialization	-0.09	-0.14	-0.31	-0.16	-0.14	-0.06	0.20	-0.3	-0.15	-0.28
Academic Rank	-0.10	0.03	0.02	0.26	0.14	-0.12	-0.06	-0.23	-0.15	-0.10
English Seminars/ Trainings Attended	0.07	0.42*	0.30	0.09	0.20	-0.14	-0.01	-0.15	-0.13	0.20

The table showed that ages has significant relationship to Impulsive teaching style (-0.37\*). The teachers let their pupils learned the English language through an experiment with minimum guidance because at their age they can facilitate teaching-learning process easily. Civil status was significantly related to visual-non-verbal and kinesthetic. Most of the teachers were married. This showed that they can teach the English language better using these styles because they were used to interact with their children through manipulating objects, building models, and setting up experiments. Moreover, number of years in teaching English was significantly related to Individual teaching style. This meant that they can easily handle their pupils because they had enough experience and exposure in teaching the language. English seminars/trainings attended was also significant related to Visual-Non-Verbal. This implied that teachers were already acquainted with the different strategies, methods and techniques in teaching the English language.

**Table 11** - Results of ANOVA Testing for Significant Differences in the Teaching Styles of the Grade V English Language Teacher in the Public School

Teaching Style	Source of Variation	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Visual Verbal	Between Groups	26.06	6	4.34	1.06	p > .05
	Within Groups	94.64	23	4.12		
	Total	120.70	29			
Visual Non-Verbal	Between Groups	195.34	6	32.56	0.95	p > .05
	Within Groups	792.08	23	34.44		
	Total	987.47	29			
Auditory	Between Groups	373.98	6	62.63	1.19	p > .05
	Within Groups	1202.42	23	52.29		
	Total	1576.70	29			
Kinesthetic	Between Groups	22.25	6	3.71	0.83	p > .05
	Within Groups	102.42	23	4.45		
	Total	124.67	29			

Global	Between Groups	69.38	6	11.56	0.06	p > .05
	Within Groups	111.58	23	4.85		
	Total	180.97	29			
Analytic	Between Groups	26.218	6	4.37	0.89	p > .05
	Within Groups	112.75	23	4.90		
	Total	138.97	29			
Reflective	Between Groups	60.62	6	10.10	0.95	p > .05
	Within Groups	244.08	23	10.61		
	Total	304.70	29			
Impulsive	Between Groups	4.80	6	0.80	0.24	p > .05
	Within Groups	78.17	23	3.40		
	Total	82.97	29			
Individual	Between Groups	18.16	6	3.03	1.69	p > .05
	Within Groups	41.31	23	1.80		
	Total	59.47	29			
Group-Oriented	Between Groups	5.00	6	0.83	2.46	p > .05
	Within Groups	7.80	23	0.34		
	Total	12.80	29			

Table 11 showed that the teaching styles of the teachers employed in the seven central schools were not significantly different. There were no significant differences between and among the teaching styles of the seven groups of teachers because they were provided with prototype lesson plans, which they used in teaching the English language. In all teaching styles, the levels of the teachers were more or less the same as revealed by the computed F-ratios, which were not significant at the .05 level.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

The study concludes that Grade V English language teachers in the seven central public schools were predominantly experienced, master's degree holders, and specialized in English, demonstrating high teaching proficiency across sensory and learning-oriented styles, particularly in global, analytic, reflective, impulsive, and group-oriented approaches. Pupils' English proficiency was generally satisfactory, and while personal and professional characteristics of teachers had no significant impact on pupil performance, specific teaching styles—such as auditory, global, individual, and group-oriented—were significantly associated with pupils' performance in vocabulary, reading comprehension, and language use. Additionally, certain teaching styles correlated with teacher characteristics like age, civil status, and years of teaching, yet teaching styles were consistent across schools, indicating uniformity in instructional approaches.

### Recommendations

Based on the conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are suggested for consideration by Grade V English language teachers and Department of Education officials:

1. English teachers may benefit from deepening their understanding of the learning process to better recognize the strengths and weaknesses of their pupils in English.

2. Familiarity with the interests, needs, and developmental patterns of pupils could help teachers provide more meaningful and engaging learning experiences.
3. Selecting teaching styles and activities that align with pupils' levels may support more effective learning and improvement in English proficiency.
4. Preparing and using relevant instructional materials may enhance lesson delivery and pupil engagement.
5. Periodic reflection on teaching styles could help teachers refine their instructional approaches for greater effectiveness.
6. Continuous development of English teaching competencies may facilitate easier and faster acquisition of language skills by pupils.
7. Department of Education officials might consider reviewing extra-curricular activities to minimize classroom disruptions and allow teachers more consistent instructional time with pupils.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Aquino, Guadencio V 2012. Principles and Methods of Teaching. Quezon City: Phoenix Publishing House, Inc.
2. Isidro, Antonio (2011). Principles of Education Applied to the Philippines. Quezon City: Phoenix Press, Inc., pp. 44-46.
3. Thommawong, Bandit. 2011. "Performance of Administrators in Nueva Segovia Archdiocesan Catholic Schools (NUSACS)," Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City.