***The Educational Philosophy and Teaching Style Preferences of College
Faculty at the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA***

Grace D. Severo, University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Philippines
Lopita U. Jung , University of Perpetual Help System DALTA, Philippines

The Asian Conference on Education 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract
This study aimed to determine the educational philosophy and teaching styles of the college faculty of the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA in the campuses of Las-Piñas, Molino, and Calamba, south of Metro Manila, Philippines. Specifically, it sought to determine the relationships between the college faculty educational philosophy and teaching styles and the University's philosophy and teaching style preferences. One hundred and five faculty members from the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences responded to the survey during the academic year 2014-2015. The Philosophy of Adult Education Inventory (PAEI) designed by Zinn (2004) was used to measure the faculty's preferred educational philosophy whereas the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) developed by Conti (2004) was used to measure the faculty's teaching style preferences.

Findings showed that the University and its faculty members did match with the progressive and humanistic educational philosophy. The differences were evident in the preferred teaching styles of both groups, the University and the faculty. This study revealed that majority of the faculty members hold the progressive educational philosophy in which their preference for the teacher-centered teaching style seemed to contradict their own belief and the University's preference for a learner-centered teaching style. This implies that teachers are certain of embracing the progressive educational philosophy, but they do not apply this philosophy's central tenet, i.e., the learner-centered teaching style. Hence, the researchers recommend that a high degree of support in the form of continuous faculty development activities which range from seminars, trainings, team-building activities, retreats, and the like be initiated and extended by the institution to its faculty members.. These activities will help both the institution and the faculty to enhance their sense of commitment toward achieving the institutional goal.

Keywords: Educational Philosophies & Teaching Style Preferences

Introduction

Learning is the purpose of all education. This is the main reason why teachers must always be conscious of their teaching practices. How teachers extend and share knowledge to their students is vital to this fast-changing society. As Bain (2004), signified, the teachers are the engineers in the learning environment, and no matter how they differ in the way they engineer their classroom environment, what truly counts is the outcome of their teaching, that is what makes a great difference in every teacher.

Too many educators have already expressed their concern on the role of teachers in the education process (McCarthy & Anderson, 2000; Andreescu, 2009; and Brookfield, 2012). They were certain in clarifying that if a teacher acts as the transmitter of knowledge, he or she is considered as a teacher-centered persona, but if the teacher allows the students to construct knowledge based on his guidance, he or she is considered a live performer of a learner-centered approach. In their effort to shed light in the issue between teacher-centered and learner-centered approaches, Conti, (2004), Elias and Merriam, (1995), Galbraith, (2004), Kauchak and Eggen, (2008) all agreed that teacher-centered may be considered an authoritative approach of teaching practice, but a conservative one in a sense that it gives importance to the values and knowledge that have survived through time. They all advanced that the major teacher-centered educational philosophies would be *liberal* and *behavioral*, while the student-centered would be democratic, self-regulated, problem-centered, and collaborative.The student-centered approach is focused on engaging students for a challenging activities which are responsive to their individual needs. The belief that the learner must be the center of the teaching-learning process is what *progressivism*, *humanism*, *reconstructionism* and *existentialism* hold. These philosophies embrace the ideal of having the students and the teachers work together in determining what must be learnt and in learning how to learn.

To put some order on these foregoing concepts, Bago,(2010), Henschke,(2010), and Petress, (2003) concluded that educational philosophy must be the basis in shaping the structure as well as the goals of the teaching relationship between the teacher and the student. Thus, the concept of teaching, with all its descriptions of how it should be delivered by the teacher constitutes every single teacher's teaching philosophy and beliefs on education.

Relative to the above is the University of Perpetual Help System DALTA's (UPHSD) institutional philosophy. The University fosters the belief *that national development and transformation is predicated upon the quality of education of its people*. Thus, it is committed to the ideas of teaching, community service and research, with "Character Building is Nation Building" as its guiding principle (UPHSD handbook). In its effort to achieve its goals, the University maintains and provides for sustaining excellence in education. However, as many educators would agree, no institution or organization is ever perfect. The institution may have instituted an extensive network of national and international linkages in Higher Education and Business, but this study reveals that the area which is often considered as the backbone of every educational institution, the faculty teaching practices, has not yet been fully instituted. It is through this context and the researchers' exposure as teachers in the tertiary level that they took cue in conducting this study. Moreover, the researchers were interested

in shedding some light to what most faculty members in the University may consider progressive and a healthy teaching practice, but in reality may not be helpful and supportive of the current educational environment that this fast-evolving society dictates. The results of this study would be beneficial not only to the faculty in general, but also to the University in particular as the findings would be a significant information for the teacher's awareness of their most preferred educational philosophy and teaching styles and of the University's as well.

Research Objectives

The main objective of this research was to investigate whether the college faculty members' general educational philosophy is congruent to the institution's philosophy.

The specific objectives of were:

1. To identify the educational philosophy dominant among the faculty members of the University;
2. To examine if the general educational philosophy of the faculty is parallel to that of the University's philosophy;
3. To identify the teaching style preferences of the faculty members;
4. To determine the relationships between educational philosophies and demographic factors of the faculty such as gender, age, and length of teaching; and
5. To identify the relationships between educational philosophies and teaching style preferences of the faculty.

Hypotheses

1. There are no statistically significant relationships between educational philosophies and demographic factors.
2. There are no statistically significant relationships between educational philosophies and teaching style preferences.

Methodology

A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was used in this study. This design consists of two distinct phases, the quantitative followed by qualitative (Creswell et al. 2003). Survey method was utilized in the quantitative phase, while document analysis and interview method was used in the qualitative phase. One hundred five (105) college faculty members were randomly selected and responded in the survey during the 2nd semester of school year 2014-2015. Educational philosophy was measured using the Philosophy of Adult Education Inventory (PAEI) (Zinn, 2004) and teaching style was measured using the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) (Conti, 2004).

The Philosophy of Adult Education Inventory (PAEI) was developed by Lorraine Zinn in 2004. It measures five educational philosophies namely: liberal, progressive, behaviorist, humanistic, and radical. This inventory consists of 15 sentences with five different options for completing the sentences. Each options has a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree with (4) neutral point in completing each sentences. According to Zinn (2004), there are no right or wrong

answers; the participant will simply choose the response that he or she most likely or most frequently does. If someone scores high in three or more orientations or evenly among all of them, the individual may need to clarify their educational beliefs and values and look for possible contradictions between them (Powell, 2006; and Zinn, 2004). The highest scores represent the philosophy the participant is most likely to exhibit in teaching. The lowest scores represent the educational philosophy the participant is least likely to practice. A score of 95 to 105 indicates that the participant strongly agrees with that educational philosophy. A score of 15 to 25 is considered a low score and indicates that the participant strongly disagrees with that particular philosophy (Zinn, 2004).

Table 1
Description of the Five Educational Philosophies Used in PAEI
Lorraine Zinn (2004)

Philosophy	Key Features
Behaviorist	Education is for behavioral change
Progressive	Education is for the development of practical problem-solving skills
Radical	Education is for major social and economic change
Liberal	Education is for intellectual development
Humanist	Education is for self-actualization

PALS (Conti, 2004) on the other hand, was developed by Gary Conti in 2004. This instrument determines the teaching styles of adult educators. It identifies how often an educator practices a teacher-centered or learner-centered approach and to determine the frequency an adult educator practices teaching style. It consists of 44 items with a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 5 (0= Always, 1= Almost always, 2= Often, 3=Seldom, 4=Almost never, 5=Never). According to Conti (2004), the lowest possible score on PALS is zero, and the highest possible score is 220. The teaching style of the educator and how strong that style can be determined by comparing the educator's score to 146. Whereas, a learner-centered approach is indicated by a score higher than 146 and a score lower than 146 indicates a teacher-centered approach. The further scores are from 146 indicate a stronger commitment to a particular style. It is possible to have middle-range scores indicating the educator exhibits a learner-centered as well as a teacher-centered approach to teaching (Conti, 2004).

This study had focused only on the following dependent and independent variables: gender, age, and length of teaching experience as independent variables; while faculty member's philosophical orientation and teaching style preference as dependent variables.

The relationship of educational philosophy and teaching styles to demographic variables was investigated using one-way ANOVA. A separate one-way ANOVA was conducted for each of the independent demographic variables and were tested at the .05 significance level. Chi-square Test of Independence was used to determine the relationships between the two teaching styles with the five philosophies.

Results and Discussions

Based on the objectives of this study, the following summary of findings were drawn:

Table 2
Distribution of the Five Philosophies of the College Faculty

Philosophy	F	Percent
Liberal	8	7.6
Behavioral	10	9.5
Progressive	50	47.6
Humanistic	18	17.1
Radical	5	4.8
Mixed	14	13.3
Total	105	100

Table 2 shows that nearly half of the teachers (47.6%) have a strong support for progressive philosophy. Faculty members were not equally distributed among the five educational philosophies. Five (4.8%) had radical philosophy, and fourteen (13.3%) have two or more philosophies.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of PAEI Scores
(n=105)

	Radical	Behavioral	Liberal	Progressive	Humanistic
N	105	105	105	105	105
Mean	71.88	80.12	75.86	86.82	80.42
Median	73.00	81.00	76.00	87.00	79.00
Mode	68[a]	80[a]	76	85[a]	77
Std. Deviation	11.56	7.78	9.02	9.22	9.75
Variance	133.66	60.63	81.45	84.93	95.01
Range	44	43	38	49	46
Minimum	50	55	55	55	55
Maximum	94	98	93	104	101

Table 3 depicts that the highest mean score of the respondents in the PAEI is 86.82 which is under the progressive type of educational philosophy. The above findings showed that the faculty members favored a progressive philosophy, and to a lesser extent the Behavioral and humanistic philosophies.

Table 4
Cross-Tabulation of Respondents' Philosophy and Teaching Styles

		Teaching Style		
		Teacher-Centered	Learner-Centered	Total
Educational Philosophy	Liberal	6	2	8
	Behavioral	6	4	10
	Progressive	30	20	50
	Humanistic	12	6	18
	Radical	4	1	5
	Mixed	10	4	14
Total		68	37	105

Table 4 shows that 68 of the faculty claimed to practice a teacher-centered teaching style, while the rest (37) claimed to be learner-centered.

Table 5
Pearson Correlation of Philosophies and Demographic Variables

	Liberal	Behaviorist	Progressive	Humanist	Radical
Liberal		.81**	.59**	.38**	.29**
Behaviorist			.72**	.42**	.30**
Progressive				.55**	.26**
Humanist					.48**
Radical					
Age	.15	.05	.01	.00	.13
Years in Teaching	.19	.16	.06	-.03	.04
Gender	.06	-.05	.14	-.02	.10

**Correlation is significant at 0.05 level

Table 5 depicts that gender and teaching experience were the only two demographic variables which had a statistically significant relationship with philosophy ($p < .05$). There was a statistically significant gender difference (see Table 6 in the appendix) for humanistic philosophy ($F = 4.890$, $p=0.032$). The female faculty members have a stronger support of humanistic philosophy than males because females scored higher on humanistic philosophy on the PAEI than males.

Table 7
Chi-Square of Philosophies and Teaching Styles

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.610[a]	5	.625
Likelihood Ratio	3.446	5	.486
Linear-by-Linear Association	.025	1	.873
N of Valid Cases	105		

Table 7 depicts that there is no statistically significant association (X^2 = 2.610) between the five philosophies and teaching styles among the faculty.

The Educational Philosophy of UPHSD

Based on context analysis, as stated on the institution's philosophy, the following keywords that are high-lighted were analyzed to be progressive and humanist views of philosophies: "The UPHSD believes and invokes Divine Guidance in the betterment of the quality of life through *national development* and *transformation*, which are predicated upon the quality of education of its people. Towards this end, the institution is committed to the *ideals of teaching*, *community service*, *and research* as it nurtures the value of *"Helpers of God,"* with *"Character Building is Nation Building,"* as its guiding principle.

Consequently, based on the result of the researchers' interview to a random sample of the faculty, it was found out that most of the faculty have a dominant philosophy of being a humanist and progressive which really matched the institutions' alignment to these philosophies as well.

Discussions

The above findings showed that the faculty members in this survey favored a progressive philosophy, and to a lesser extent the humanistic philosophy, yet they prefer a teacher-centered teaching style. Demographic variables of the faculty could be one factor of this mismatch. This is because teaching experience and gender found to have a statistical significant relationship to educational philosophy. These associations may indicate that those faculty members who had teaching experience of more than 5 years tend to commit on a progressive and humanist philosophies, yet they practice a teacher-centered teaching style.

Another contributing factor that the researchers looked at was the previous teaching experiences of the faculty who participated in this study. Some of them are former basic education teachers who had previous teaching experience in one or more grade/high school level in the basic education curriculum; such as in the college of

education and Liberal Arts. Literature reviewed stated that most preschool, elementary and secondary schools are a culture of a traditional and teacher-centered academic environment.

Statistically, those who scored lower than the PAEI mean or in the "low level of commitment" to their educational philosophy could be a possible explanation for those who had mixed philosophies.

Furthermore, based on context analysis, the stated philosophy of the UPHSD was determined to be progressive and humanistic, this is a match with the the result in PAEI survey and interview among the faculty. On the other hand, based on the OBE framework, the teaching style preference of the UPHSD is determined to be learner-centered which did not match with those of the faculty members' preference for teacher-centered teaching style.

The UPHSD do not clearly declare that the college faculty must have an educational philosophy which matches the institution's philosophy. It is not delineated by the institution if it is necessary for faculty to commit to learner-centered teaching, although there were trainings provided for them with regards to learner-centered teaching style and also the OBE curriculum favors it. If the institution made it clear to the faculty whether or not they were expected to model the learner-centered, then the need for faculty commitment to it would be established and at the same time would fuel the University's drive for a sustainable educational excellence.

Conclusions

Conclusions in this study are based on the findings concerning the college faculty members of UPHSD. These were stated as follows:

1. The results of the PAEI indicate that most of the faculty had dominant educational philosophies of progressive and humanist. Statistically, based on findings, demographic variables such as age and teaching experience found to have significant relationships to educational philosophies. This implies that age and teaching experience is one contributing factors to educational philosophy. The higher the age and teaching experiences of the teachers, the are more likely they tend to be progressive or humanist in their teaching ideology.

2. The PALS results showed that majority of the faculty are teacher-centered. Statistically, both the learner-centered group and the teacher-centered group had the largest portion of their scores in PALS which indicated a statistically "moderate commitment" to one of these teaching styles. This implies that the faculty members of UPHSD in this study tend not to stick on either of the teaching styles or they are more likely to use more than one teaching method.

3. The statistical significant gender difference for humanistic philosophy implies that the female faculty members tend to have a stronger support for humanistic philosophy than males because females scored higher on humanistic philosophy on the PAEI than males.

4. The statistical significant association of age to teaching style implies that faculty in this study whose ages are from 40 and above and had previous experiences teaching in different levels/grades in the basic education curriculum are still opt to use teacher-centered teaching style.

5. There was no statistical significant association between the educational philosophies and teaching styles. Statistically, the variables are independent or no association at all; this means that those faculty members in this study who have more than one educational philosophy also tend to have a mixed teaching method.

6. Despite the obvious match between the school and teachers' educational philosophies on progressive and humanist, the actual teaching strategy does not match the school's philosophy of being progressive and learner-centered.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis and conclusions, the following recommendations are given:

1. The professional development of the faculty at UPHSD can be strengthened through trainings or workshops on the conceptual framework of the learner-centered teaching style embedded in the OBE curriculum. This could mean that with exposure and knowledge about these can increase the level of commitment to practice learner-centered activities.

2. Further research should be conducted to investigate whether the classroom application of teaching methods and teacher-learner exchanges of the college faculty at UPHSD are teacher-centered or learner-centered. This would expand the results of this study to discover if the actual classroom behaviors of the teachers is similar to their educational ideology.

3. Further research should be conducted to investigate whether the students at UPHSD believe their teachers employ teacher-centered or learner-centered teaching styles.

4. Further research should be conducted to determine if there is disagreement between the educational philosophy and teaching style among college faculty at other universities. It could broaden the scope of this study's conclusion. This would either confirm the findings of this study.

5. Further research should be conducted to determine if there is association between other personal factors such as age and the field of specialization of the college faculty is teaching to their educational philosophy; and to their teaching style.

References

Andreescu, P. (2009). Improving Practice in Continuing Education. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Bago, C. (2010). Supervision of Instruction. National Bookstore.

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (2012). Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Creswell, J. W., V. L. Plano Clark, M. Gutmann, and W. Hanson (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In *Handbook on mixed methods in the behavioral and social sciences*, ed. A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie, 209–40. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Conti, G. (2004). Identifying your teaching style. In M.W.Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods* (3rd ed.).Malabra, FL: Kreiger Publishing.

Elias, J. L. & Merriam, S. B. (1995). *Philosophical foundations of adult education* (2 ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company

Galbraith, M. W. (2004). *Adult learning methods: a guide for effective instruction (3rd ed). Malabar, FL: Kreiger Publishing Company.*

Henschke, J. (2010). An International Capsule of the History and Philosophy of Andragogy. In Proceedings of the 29th Annual Midwest Research to Practice. Conference in Adult, Continuing, Community, and Extension Education, East Lansing, Michigan, September 26-28, 2010. Retrieved from: ebscohost database.

Kauchak, D. and Eggen, P. (2008). Introduction to Teaching: Becoming a Professional (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

McCarthy, J. P, & Anderson, L. (2000). Active learning techniques versus traditional teaching styles: Two experiments from history and political science. *Innovative Higher Education*, Volume 24, Issue 4, pp 279-294.

Petress, K. (2003). An educational philosophy guides the pedagogical process. *College Student Journal* (*37*)1, 128-134.

Powell, L. (2006). An Exploratory Study of the Philosophy and Teaching Styles of Alabama Workforce Education and Entrepreneurship Instructors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University.

Zinn, L. M. (2004). Exploring your Philosophical Orientation. In M. W. Galbraith (Ed.), Adult Learning Methods: A Guide for Effective Instruction (3rd ed.). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.

Appendix

Table 6 ANOVA of PAEI and Gender

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.[*]
Radical	Between Groups	227.2	1	227.2	1.728	.196
	Within Groups	13544.5	103	131.5		
	Total	13771.7	104			
Behavioral	Between Groups	4.4	1	4.44	.072	.790
	Within Groups	6378.79	103	61.93		
	Total	6383.19	104			
Liberal	Between Groups	10.7	1	10.67	.128	.722
	Within Groups	8558.27	103	83.09		
	Total	8568.97	104			
Progressive	Between Groups	162.7	1	162.6	1.957	.169
	Within Groups	8559.3	103	83.1		
	Total	8722	104			
Humanistic	Between Groups	426.8	1	426.8	4.890	.032[*]
	Within Groups	8991.9	103	87.3		
	Total	9418.7	104			

*$p < .05$ level

Table 8 ANOVA PAEI & Teaching Experience (N=105)

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.[*]
Radical	Between Groups	89.003	1	89.003	.661	.421
	Within Groups	13873.79	103	134.697		
	Total	13962.79	104			
Behavioral	Between Groups	177.803	1	177.80	3.071	.087
	Within Groups	5963.7	103	57.90		
	Total	6141.5	104			
Liberal	Between Groups	492.336	1	492.336	6.848	.012*
	Within Groups	7405.39	103	71.897		
	Total	7897.63	104			
Progressive	Between Groups	22.003	1	22.003	.255	.616
	Within Groups	8897.66	103	86.385		
	Total	8919.66	104			
Humanistic	Between Groups	31.803	1	31.803	.330	.569
	Within Groups	9937.75	103	96.483		
	Total	9969.55	104			

*$p < .05$ level

Table 9
Demographic Variables

Age	F	Percent
	(n = 105)	
20-30	3	2.8
31-35	5	4.8
36-40	8	7.6
41-45	18	17.1
46-50	19	18.1
51-55	18	17.1
56-60	13	12.4
61-65	14	13.3
65+	7	6.7
Gender		
Female	81	77.2
Male	24	22.8
Length of Teaching Experience		
Less than five years	34	32.4
Five and above years	71	67.6

Contact e-mail: grace.severo2012@gmail.com