# Instructional Performance and Teaching Methods and Strategies of the BSE-TLE faculty in PSU

**Jocelyn C. Abalos**
abalosjoce30@gmail.com
Faculty, College of Education, PSU Lingayen Campus

*Abstract- This study looked into the "Instructional Performance and Teaching Methods and Strategies of the BSE-TLE Faculty in Pangasinan State University," school year 2012-2013, as perceived by the faculty members and students. Questionnaire was used in collecting data and was analyzed using frequency counts, percentage means and t-test for paired samples.*

*The faculty respondents are predominantly male, married, young adult, attended graduate education with relatively enough expertise in teaching, and had attended trainings. The faculty members frequently use appropriate teaching methods and strategies in the delivery of the lessons.*

*In this study, the descriptive-comparative and correlational method of research were used. The design described the profile of Faculty of Pangasinan State University teaching Technology and Livelihood Education in terms of their age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, major field of specialization, relevant trainings and seminars attended and number of years in teaching and the extent of use of teaching strategies and methodologies.*

*It is recommended that the university should encourage faculty members to update their competencies and skills through attendance to trainings as there are newer trends and technologies that are being discovered or evolved.*

*Keywords: BSE-TLE, Instructional Performance, Teaching Methods & Strategies*

## INTRODUCTION

Globalization creates trends and innovations that influence global as well as national conditions. The Philippine educational system is not spared in this fast-changing innovation in science and technologies where tremendous efforts require the latest knowledge, skills, and range of competencies in education. These trends and directions bring out the existence of global knowledge economy that provides a strong emphasis in learning. ( De Asis, 2007).

Philosophy of education, which should be ultimate basis of any curriculum design or reform, has to be relevant and responsive to our rapidly changing world. Filipino learners are being reshaped by multilateral interactions among global systems, local practice, international trends, and personal lifestyles. Today's world has borderless information and communication, commodities, financial investments, etc. Filipino learners need an educational system that will empower them for a lifelong learning or that will enable them to be competent in learning how to learn. (Baligat,2008).

Education is the most efficient system of equipping people with knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for effective membership in society. It consists of general and specialized education which are acquired through formal, non-formal or informal schemes. A major sub-system of education dealing with the technological aspects of the environment is technology education. In its general form, technology education seeks to help people

become technology- literate and equips them with basic skills, knowledge and understanding of the scope, materials, equipment, processes, products, problems, and developments in the world of work. In its specialized form, technology education seeks to prepare people for work, either as skilled worker, technician, technologist or technology teacher and specialist. (Camarao,1991).

The new drivers of skills' policies and strategies are many, but they include the following. The very success of the last decade of supporting universal primary education is translating into huge political pressures to expand both general and technical secondary education. Secondly, good quality skills are increasingly seen as being critical to labor market productivity and competitiveness. Despite the depth of the current economic crisis, skills are also claimed to be at the center of the new challenge of sustaining, accelerating and sharing the signs of economic growth across many parts of the developing world (DFID 2008).

A worker who lacks skills that are valued in global and local economies faces limited job opportunities and income growth. Good, demand-driven TVET is an important tool for skilling young people both in and out of school (USAID).

To fit present social and economic developments, vocational school and industry enterprises cooperation is one of the most effective methods for vocational education. Training the skills-based teachers is the important guarantee for the development of vocational education. The information and communication (ICT), has provided a wide variety of activities and experiences that support vocational education. The reform will make the TVET more and more sensitive to social and economic changes and demands.

Technology education has become the major thrust of the nation and that under the Basic Education Curriculum, the study of technology is provided through the inclusion of Science and Technology and Technology and Livelihood Education, which addresses one of the objectives of Secondary education provided for in the Education Act of 1982 or the Batas Pambansa 232.

The latter is one of the most important curricular subjects offered in the secondary schools today and it focuses on the family as the center of domestic life and recognizes that providing the needs of home now will greatly influence the personal growth and development of the individuals and their status in the future. Its goals and objectives are directed to quality home and family life and community living.

Technology and Livelihood Education Curriculum (TLE) Program is one of the components of the Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE) Curriculum. It is designed to enable the students to acquire a working knowledge of materials, tools and equipment and to perform processes for the production of foods. Subjects under this program include Basic Drafting, Business Math, Foods, Basic Electricity, Basic Electronics, Carpentry and Masonry, Basic Plumbing, Cosmetology, Entrepreneurship, Basic Garments and Basic Handicraft. The objective of the program is to provide avenue for the development of skill-based competencies anchored on the Technology and Livelihood Education Program.

Teaching Technology and Livelihood Education requires various knowledge and skill competencies to prepare the students for a better life. Teachers in this field are expected to have integrated information in teaching the subject and its content. This requires competence both in subject matter and skills. The teachers are expected not only to be knowledgeable in its content but also to have dexterity of skills. But in actual situation, there seems to be a big gap between theory and practice.

Thus, if the teacher is lacking in skills, it is expected that the students may find themselves in the same situation. In this regard, Technology education instructional leaders are expected to give them adequate training and developments to enhance and upgrade the skills and knowledge of TLE teachers especially on new developments in technology. They should be encouraged to do their best to improve the quality of teaching process to produce quality output.

Teachers are important for the success of the students. Technology education is expected to give enough knowledge, training and skills to our students especially on new developments in technology so that they can compete in the present world of work. (Almoite, 2001)

The realization of these observed evidences led to the undertaking of this study on how teachers attain quality performance to uplift total quality competence of the students and in this manner will motivate them to perform their best. It is strongly believed that the valuable information generated from this study can help our TLE faculty to at least determine which instructional strengths they have that need to be maintained and weak points which need to be improved or enhanced in order to give their best to produce quality students.

The Pangasinan State University is one of the higher education institutions of the technology education curriculum. It has been in operation for the last 32 years to date. It was established as a government Tertiary education institution by virtue of P.D. 1497, promulgated on June 1, 1978 and took effect on July 1, 1979. Under this law, PD 1497, PSU exists as a university system by having integrated originally the colleges in the Province of Pangasinan. These colleges now constitute the different campuses of the University which are the following to wit: Asingan Campus, Bayambang Campus, Binmaley Campus, Infanta Campus, Lingayen Campus, San Carlos Campus, Sta. Maria Campus and Urdaneta Campus. With these campuses, Asingan Campus, Lingayen Campus, San Carlos Campus and Sta. Maria Campus are offering BSE major in Technology and Livelihood Education, hence they are the subjects of this study.

In accordance to the Republic Act (RA) 7722, otherwise known as the Higher Education Act of 1994, to rationalize the undergraduate and to keep pace with the demands of global competitiveness in the next millennium to provide quality education, a new General Education Curriculum was adopted and promulgated by CHED.

To date there are 1,469 students enrolled in the BSE program, 369 of whom specializes Technology and Livelihood Education from 356 of last year. An increase of 13 or 3.52 percent. The present status of enrolment in BSE –TLE Program indicates that there is a marked degree of increased. While this is an encouraging indicator that the program is gaining momentum accompanying indicators like rate of graduation should be considered. But on the contrary the number of those who pursued and stayed until they graduate seems to have decreased from 99 students of the last school year to 66 of the current year, which is 33 or 33.33 percent difference.

It is in conformity with the functions of instructional leaders to promote high standard of education and achieve its goal to produce quality and skillful graduates. Since its offering, no study has been conducted on the Instructional Performance and Teaching Methods and Strategies of the BSE-TLE Faculty of Pangasinan State University. Hence this study.

**Statement of the Problem**

The study determined the Instructional Performance and Teaching Methods and Strategies of the BSE-TLE faculty in PSU. Specifically, it sought answers to the following:

1. What is the profile of the faculty respondents in terms of the following:
   a. age;
   b. sex;
   c. civil status
   d. educational attainment;
   e major field of specialization;
   f. relevant trainings and seminars attended;
   g. length of teaching experience?
2. What is the frequency of use of teaching methods and strategies?
3. What is the level of instructional performance of the faculty in PSU as perceived by the students and faculty themselves in terms of the following:
   a. Commitment;
   b. Knowledge of subject;
   c. Teaching for independent learning;
   d. Management of Learning?

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The design employed the descriptive-comparative and correlational method of research. Descriptive -comparative refers to the type of descriptive research which tries to discover not only what a phenomenon is, but, if possible, how and why it occurs. It compares the similarities and differences among phenomena to find out what factors or circumstances seem to accompany or contribute to the occurrence of certain events, conditions or practices. On the other hand, descriptive correlational refers to the degree of relationship or correlation between two or more traits, behaviors, or events.

This study described the profile of Faculty of Pangasinan State University teaching Technology and Livelihood Education in terms of their age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, major field of specialization, relevant trainings and seminars attended and number of years in teaching and the extent of use of teaching strategies and methodologies.

There was a comparison between the level of perception of faculty and students on the instructional performance of faculty in terms of commitment, knowledge of subject matter, teaching for independent learning and management of learning. It also determined the relationship between the instructional performance of faculty with their personal profile and extent of use of teaching strategies and methodologies.

Appropriate statistical tools were employed to describe and to test the difference and relationship of different variable used in the study.

This study covered four campuses of PSU who are offering Technology and Livelihood Education, namely: Asingan Campus, Lingayen Campus, San Carlos Campus, and Sta. Maria Campus.

Respondents included students from second year to fourth year levels who were enrolled in the program for the current school year 2012-2013. Faculty respondents were those handling subjects in TLE in the different campuses of the University.

Random sampling of students and total enumeration of faculty was used. A Survey questionnaire was prepared as an instrument in gathering relevant information needed in the study. Two sets of questionnaires were used, one for the faculty and another one for the students with the same content except the faculty profile.

Gathering of data was done by gathering the students at one setting or per year level in each campus and was personally administered by the researcher by introducing first the purpose and objective of the study before the actual survey. Likewise, for the faculty - respondent.

Data were processed using computer.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This is a descriptive study that tried to ascertain the Instructional Performance and Teaching Methods and Strategies of the BSE-TLE Faculty in the different campuses of Pangasinan State University that are offering the program during the school year 2012-2013. The design employed the descriptive-comparative and correlational method of research. It made use of a questionnaire-checklist to gather the needed data. The study involved thirty (30) faculty members and one hundred sixty- two (162) students.

Results of the statistical analysis done and the interpretation of findings are presented in the tables following the sequence of specific research problems propounded.

### PROFILE OF FACULTY RESPONDENTS

Table 1 projects the profile of the respondents as to age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, specialization, length of teaching experience and trainings attended.

### Age

As to age brackets, a bigger number of faculty is within the 31-40 years old with 12 or 40 percent, and two or 6.7 percent each are within the 21-30 years and 61-65 years brackets. In

effect, the faculty members under study are a mixture of very young and about to retire instructors or professors with the bulk who are middle aged.

### Table 1

### Age, Sex and Civil Status of the Respondents

| Age- Range | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 21-30 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 31-40 | 12 | 40.0 |
| 41-50 | 7 | 23.3 |
| 51-60 | 7 | 23.3 |
| 61 and above | 2 | 6.7 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |
| **Sex** | | |
| Male | 18 | 60 |
| Female | 12 | 40 |
| | **30** | **100** |
| **Civil Status** | | |
| Single | 2 | 6.7 |
| Married | 28 | 93.3 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |

**Sex**

As regards sex, the group is predominantly males with twelve (12) or 40 percent female against 18 or 60 percent males.

This is a ratio of four females to six males.

**Civil Status**

According to marital status, there were only 2 or 6.7% of the thirty instructors who were single and 28 or 93.3% who were married. They were mostly married with a relatively few young and single faculty.

**Educational Attainment**

As to highest educational attainment achieved, majority (18 or 60 percent) have finished their master of arts degrees, 11 or 36.7 percent have endeavored to take units in the doctor of education programs, while 10 or 33.3 percent are on the process of completing their master of arts degrees. There are only two found to have only their bachelor degrees.

**Major Field of Specialization**

Regarding specialization or major fields of concentration pursued, twelve (12) or 40 percent were found to have finished hard technology courses for females or girls' courses most of the BSIE programs such as Food Trades, Garments Trades, Girls Vocational course, Home Technology and cosmetology majors. One (1) or 3.34 percent was found to have taken a course in nutrition and dietetics. Among the hard technology graduates for male courses, are drafting, electronics, electrical technology, automotive and woodworking majors. There are nine (9) or 30 percent in this category. Four (4) or 13.33 percent others were found to have taken engineering and agriculture related courses. There are also four (4) or 13.33 percent others who are found to have pursued academic-related majors such as BSBM and Math courses. One was a BEE major while one was a BSIT graduate.

**Trainings and Seminars Attended**

Regarding trainings and seminars attended, majority of the respondents had not attended trainings related to their major fields of specialization. There are 16 or 53.33 percent who claimed to belong to this category while 10 or 33.34 percent claimed to have attended between one to five (1-5) relevant trainings. Four (4) or 13.33 percent have been found to have attended between six to seven (6-7) relevant trainings. Along trainings attended which they claimed to be irrelevant, or not related,14 or 46.66 percent of the faculty respondents had attended such, ten (10) or 13.33 percent have attended between one to five trainings, four others had more than five trainings. The figure shows that the most acceptable practical way of developing the human resources especially in the teaching service is training. These are organized and implemented based on the assessed needs for better quality of performance of the teachers. However, these training courses attended by those identified instructors may not guarantee the best results. The reasons are varied and many.

**Length of Teaching Experience**

As to the length of teaching experience, 12 belong to the less than 1 to 10 years which constitute 40 percent of the teaching force. Eight (8) or 26.68 percent others fall within the 11 to 20 years of teaching experiences and the other five (5) or 16.66 percent have spent 21 to 30 years in the teaching profession. The remaining five (5) or 16.66 percent claimed to have served for more than 30 years already and some of them are about to leave the service soon. The majority of the respondents fall under the bracket of twenty to more than thirty years of service are the pioneers of the institution. The data are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2**

**Educational Attainment, Major Field of Specialization, Number of Trainings and Seminars Attended and Length of Teaching Experience of the Faculty**

| Educational Qualification | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Bachelor Degree | 2 | 6.7 |
| BS with MA units | 10 | 33.3 |
| Masters Degree | 7 | 23.3 |
| MA Degree with Doc Units | 11 | 36.7 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |

| Major Field of Specialization | | |
|---|---|---|
| Hard Tech (male) | 9 | 30 |
| Hard Tech (female) | 12 | 40 |
| Engineering & Agriculture related courses | 4 | 13.33 |
| Nutrition and Dietetics | 1 | 3.34 |
| Academic | 4 | 13.33 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |

**Number of Trainings and Seminars**

| Attended | No | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1-5 | 10 | 33.34 |
| | More than 5 | 4 | 13.33 |
| | 0 (none) | 16 | 53.33 |
| **Total** | | **30** | **100** |

| Length of Teaching Experience | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1-10 years | 12 | 40 |
| 11-20 years | 8 | 26.68 |
| 21-30 years | 5 | 16.66 |
| 31 years and more | 5 | 16.66 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100** |

## FREQUENCY OF USE OF TEACHING METHODS AND STRATEGIES

Table 3 presents the teaching strategies used by faculty members as perceived by the students and faculty themselves. It can be gleaned from Table 4 that the faculty respondents perceived that the laboratory method (4.83) as always used teaching strategy. This is usually true as the students will learn more when they learn by doing the activity as demonstrated by the instructor. This is closely followed by the demonstration method (4.77) where the students learn by imitating the teacher as he/she demonstrates the skill to be learned.

The students then have to imitate the teacher during the laboratory or the students are made to return the demonstration as shown or performed by the teacher. On the part of the students though, the lecture method and the demonstration method got identical means of 4.55 to mean that both strategies were perceived to be both as *always used* or of equal importance as teaching strategies.

**Table 3**

**Frequency of Use of Methods and Strategies in Teaching by the Faculty as assessed by the Students and Faculty themselves**

| Teaching Strategies | Faculty | | Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AWM | DR | AWM | DR |
| 1.Demonstration method | 4.77 | A | **4.55** | A |
| 2.Project Method | 4.47 | A | 3.99 | O |
| 3.Discussion Method | 4.33 | A | 4.27 | A |
| 4.Lecture Method | 4.40 | A | **4.55** | **A** |
| 5.Laboratory Method | 4.83 | **A** | 4.50 | A |
| 6.Field Trip Method | **3.33** | **M** | **2.87** | **M** |
| 7.Modularized Method | 3.40 | O | 3.42 | O |
| 8.Discovery Method | 3.50 | O | 3.38 | M |
| 9.Reporting | 3.47 | O | 3.76 | O |
| 10.Simulations | 4.03 | O | 3.80 | O |
| 11. Group dynamics | 3.53 | O | 3.55 | O |
| 12.Computer –Assisted Instruction | 3.43 | O | 3.58 | O |
| 13. Question and Answer | 3.83 | O | 3.93 | O |
| **Over-All Average Mean (OAWM)** | **3.95** | **OU** | **3.86** | **OU** |

Data further reveals that the field trip method were rated as the lowest extent of use for both respondents 3.33, and 2.87 respectively with a descriptive- ratings of *seldom used* with the faculty giving the higher rating. This implies that both set of respondents are of the contention that there is not much learned during a field trip especially on the side of the students. Also seen as least rated strategies by the teachers is the use of modularized instruction (3.40), computer- assisted instruction (3.43) and reporting method (3.47). On the other hand, students too, see the discovery method (3.38) and modularized instruction (3.42) as least use over the other methods. Both sets of respondents then consider modularized instruction as least effective as there is no immediate follow-up as to whether the skill or concept is learned or internalized. On the case of reporting method, by and large, students just read their reports and their interpretation or understanding of what they are reading is uncertain.

On the average, both respondents rated the listed teaching strategies 3.95 and 3.86 respectively, as *often used* with the set of students giving lesser mean ratings to imply that they consider the teaching strategies used lower as against the higher assessments given by their teachers. As could be gleaned from the table, six of the teaching strategies were rated lower by the students. Five others though were rated a little higher than what their instructors have rated. In education, students do study in order to gain a firm understanding of how technology works and techniques to develop "technological literacy".

This is accomplished by providing students with field and laboratory work and activities to gain a first- hand account on technological studies. "Technology education curriculum should continue to include hands-on learning methods associated with problem-solving activities". (Cardon, 2000).

## LEVEL OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE OF FACULTY

Instructional performance of faculty considered in this study included area of Commitment, Teaching for Independent Learning, Knowledge of the Subject and Management of Learning.

### Faculty Commitment

Table 4 shows the level of commitment of faculty workers as perceived by the students and faculty themselves.

In all areas of commitment, the faculty gave a higher numerical rating to their level of commitment as compared to the rating given by the students to their level of commitment.

Of the five statements, the students gave the highest numerical rating to their faculty in keeping accurate records and in the immediate return of corrected quizzes. Immediate checking of students' papers will give the students the idea that their written performance is evaluated and recorded.

Hence, they would think that the faculty is giving fair assessment to his students. On the part of the faculty, they gave the highest numerical rating to their commitment in considering the students' opinions and encouragement of students' participation.

The faculty believes in the ability of the students who are the ultimate beneficiaries of quality instruction. The teacher seeks feedback in order to determine whether what has been said has been understood. This gives the faculty an opportunity to correct errors on his part of misunderstandings on the part of the students. Moreover, students are permitted to learn from one another.

In any learning situation, learning can be more effective if communication does not take a one-way channel, but rather a two-way communicative relationship between teachers and students in ascending order of their effectiveness. (Lingren,1980). Overall, the

faculty level of commitment as rated by the students is very satisfactory while the faculty rated themselves outstanding as seen in numerical rating of 3.84 and 4.61, respectively.

The outstanding instructional performance of faculty is due to his dedication and commitment in his job. Despite the limited resources he can effectively perform his

functions. It is evidently manifested through his personal initiative by being resourceful to render quality education to the students.

**Table 4**

**Level of Commitment of Faculty as Perceived by the Students and Faculty Themselves**

| Qualifying Statements | Faculty | | Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AWM | DR | AWM | DR |
| 1. The faculty is sensitive to the students' learning needs and understands their ability to absorb information regarding the subject matter. | 4.73 | O | 3.90 | VS |
| 2. The faculty considers the students' opinions and encourages participation in the attainment of the learning objectives. | **4.83** | **O** | 3.92 | VS |
| 3. The faculty speaks clearly and explains the lessons adequately. | 4.43 | O | 3.61 | V S |
| 4. The faculty regularly comes to class on time, well-groomed ad well-prepared to complete assigned responsibilities. | 4.43 | O | 3.82 | VS |
| 5. The faculty keeps accurate records to students' performance and returns corrected quizzes immediately. | 4.63 | O | **3.94** | **V S** |
| **Over-All Weighted Mean (OAWM)** | **4.61** | **O** | **3.84** | **VS** |

**Knowledge of Subject**

The next table presents the instructional performance of the faculty along knowledge of the subject.

**Table 5**

**Level of Knowledge of Subject Matter as Perceived by the
Students and Faculty Themselves**

| Qualifying Statements | Faculty | | Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AWM | DR | AWM | DR |
| **1.** The faculty explains and connects different ideas to a given topic without completely depending on textbooks and references. | 4.63 | O | **4.10** | **V S** |
| **2**. The faculty shares in the class information regarding the latest developments/updates in his /her discipline. | 4.33 | O | **3.76** | **V S** |
| **3**. The faculty provides the class examples/discussions on the current developments and experiences with regards to the lesson in relation to their daily life activities. | **4.73** | **O** | 4.00 | V S |
| **4.** The faculty demonstrates up-to-date knowledge and/or awareness on current trends and issues of the subject taught. | **4.23** | **O** | 3.84 | V S |
| **Over-All Weighted Mean (OAWM)** | **4.48** | **O** | **3.92** | **V S** |

It could be noted that the same observation that was shown in Table 6 that the faculty respondents rated themselves as *outstanding* while the students rated their teachers as *very satisfactory*. It seems that the faculty had their Halo Effect of rating themselves very high in all four listed indicators. This is usually true to people who tend to rate themselves high, a natural phenomenon. But the students on the one hand do not confirm such self- assessments of their teachers as they rated them lower in their performance. Meanwhile the highest rating was given by the faculty on the item "*the faculty provides the class examples /discussions on the current developments and experiences with regards to the lesson in relation to their daily life activities"* (4.73*)*.

On the other hand, the students had the item *"the faculty explains and connects different ideas to a given topic without completely depending on textbooks and references"* (4.0) as highest. This means that the students are very

appreciative of the capabilities of their professors. That the students seem to imply that the faculty are very conversant with their topics and they try to connect them with real life situations or they can connect previous learning to the topics being discussed or presented. The lowest rating was given by the faculty on the aspect of sharing to item number 2 by the faculty of themselves which is on, '*the faculty shares in the class information regarding the latest developments/updates in his /her discipline* (4.33) as against the rating of the

students of 3.7, also considered lowest by the students. There is then agreement of both sets on the manner was rated as it was second lowest by the faculty. The item '*the faculty demonstrates up-to-date knowledge and/or awareness on current trends and issues of the subject taught*' (4.23), was lowest by the teachers. This is to mean the faculty seem to be least updated with the latest trend or knowledge as there seems to be an avalanche of newer trends and issues. It can be noted that this item was also the second lowest (3.84) of the students. As stated previously, the instructional leaders are expected to give the teachers adequate training and developments to enhance and upgrade the skills and knowledge of the TLE instructors especially on new developments in technology or current trends. Technology education is expected to give enough knowledge and skills to our students especially on

new developments so that they can compete in the present world of work.

**Teaching for Independent Learning**

The following table depicts the level of instructional performance as perceived by the faculty and students along teaching for independent learning. It could be gleaned from the table that the teachers, similar to the previous table along knowledge of subject, had rated themselves with ratings that are categorically *outstanding.* The students on one hand also were consistent on the manner they rated their teachers, similar to their ratings along knowledge of subject matter, also consistently *very satisfactory.* The students and the faculty gave similar trends of ratings for both, with the students giving lower performance ratings of the teachers.

**Table 6**

**Level of Teaching Competence for Independent Learning as Perceived
by the Faculty and Students**

| Qualifying Statements | Faculty | | Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AWM | DR | AWM | DR |
| **1**. The faculty uses teaching strategies that simplify concepts and ideas to the students' level of understanding. | 4.63 | O | **4.04** | **VS** |
| **2.** The faculty provides an environment which allows the student to learn on their own which results to independent learning. | 4.57 | O | 3.76 | V S |
| **3.** The faculty develops independent thinking among the students and recognizes their viewpoints and opinions. | **4.70** | **O** | 3.80 | V S |
| **4.** The faculty encourages class participation for students to continuously learn and help/guide them in applying the concepts. | **4.53** | **O** | **4.04** | **V S** |
| **Over-All Weighted Mean (OAWM)** | **4.61** | O | **3.91** | VS |

Based on the table, the faculty respondents recorded the four listed indicators of faculty performance along teaching of independent learning as outstanding. The faculty respondents

recorded the highest mean on item number 3 "*the faculty develops independent thinking among the*

*students and recognizes their viewpoints and opinions"* 4.70). They seem to imply that there was the effort of the teachers to develop independent thinking by recognizing the ideas presented by their individual students. Such gesture of teachers would not dampen the spirits of students to give freely their ideas about a certain topic being discussed. Coming as close second by the faculty is their contention of '*using teaching strategies that simplify concepts and ideas to the students' level of understanding'* (4.63). This means that the faculty are claiming that they know how to customize their teaching by trying to suit their teaching strategies to the level of their students. Consistently however, the students had also this particular item as their second highest to jibe with the ranking given by their instructors. Learning at its best is thinking, thinking is the process whereby one makes sense of a hodgepodge of perceived facts through a process called either conceptualization or categorization (Bigge,1980).

A learner is a purposive participant in the knowledge-getting process who selects, structures, retains, and transforms information (Bruner 1966). On the other hand, the students' rated all the four listed indicators of faculty performance along teaching of independent learning as *very satisfactory.*

Meanwhile the students rated as highest, items number 1 and 4, *the faculty uses teaching strategies that simplify concepts and ideas to the students' level of understanding"* (4.04) and *"the faculty encourages class participation for students to continuously learn and help/guide them in*

*applying the concepts"* (4.04). The lowest rating was noted on item number 2, which is along the concept *"the faculty provides an environment which allows the student to learn on their own which results to independent learning"* (3.76).

The students also then are of the belief that their teachers also exerted effort to develop independent thinking or concepts among the students.

### Management of Learning

The following table presents the level of instructional performance of faculty along management of learning.

It is observed that similar to the other two sets of instructional competencies, the same trend of responses of the sets of respondents was observed also in this particular concern. Comparatively, the faculty members had rated this area as second lowest among the other three areas but the students on the other hand had rated it higher than the other areas. It is implied that the students had a better way of looking into the instructional performance of the teachers when compared to the ratings they gave on the other three areas. It means that to the minds of the students, the teachers are better along management of learning than along commitment, knowledge of subject matter, and teaching for independent learning. However, it is observed that the overall means of the sets did not differ much mathematically.

**Table 7**

**Level of Management of Learning as Perceived by the Faculty and Students**

| Qualifying Statements | Faculty | | Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AWM | DR | AWM | DR |
| **1.** The faculty gives assignments requirements which help develop the abilities and potentials. | 4.57 | O | **4.04** | **VS** |
| **2**. The faculty assumes multiple roles as facilitator, resource person and coach to encourage students to learn and understand their lessons. | **4.70** | **O** | 4.03 | VS |
| **3**. The faculty uses appropriate instructional materials and strategies (audio/video materials, fieldtrips, film showing, computer aided instruction and etc.) to support learning processes. | **4.37** | **O** | **3.79** | **V S** |
| **Over-All Weighted Mean (OAWM)** | **4.54** | **O** | **3.95** | **V S** |

Based from the table above, the faculty respondents rated the three listed indicators of faculty performance along management of learning as *outstanding,* with the second item as highest which assumes that, "*the faculty assumes multiple roles as facilitator, resource person and coach to encourage students to learn and understand their lessons*" *(*4.70*).*

This means that the faculty respondents claimed that they are more conversant along this role over the other two roles. This is being seconded on their role as "*giving assignment, requirements, which help develop the abilities and potentials'* of the students (4.57). It behooves that the instructors use appropriate

assignments or tasks to their students which they think are most appropriate and within the capabilities and capacities of the students. On the other hand, the students' rated the above-mentioned strategy as the highest performance indicator of faculty performance along management of learning as *very satisfactory* (4.04) which is closely seconded by the item which was earlier rated as highest among the teachers. While item 3 "*the faculty uses appropriate instructional materials and strategies (audio/video materials, fieldtrips, film showing, computer aided instruction and etc.) to support learning processes"* (4.37) was the lowest by the faculty and seconded by the students (3.79).

The developments in the computer industry have very strong implications to education, particularly technology education. Using a program instruction format, it has the capability to interact with the student which is a very critical factor in the learning process. Moreover, computer can store many instructional modules and can provide display feature that makes learning interesting.

More or less, the first two ratings of the students were more or less equal or the same in breadth. This means that the students have better faith of their teachers along their practice of giving assignments or activities that the faculty think to be commensurate to the abilities of the students.

## DIFFERENCE ON THE EXTENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PERFORMANCE AS PERCEIVED BY FACULTY AND STUDENTS

The differences between the means of the two groups were all negative values to indicate that the faculty raters gave significantly higher ratings than the students in all four areas which are commitment, knowledge of subject, teaching for independent learning, and management of learning.

**Instructional Performance**

Furthermore, since the values under significant differences were .0000, it is to construe that all four areas evaluated were all significantly different, even at .01 level. Hence, the null hypothesis that there are no significant differences in the ratings given by the two set of respondents is rejected as there existed significant differences.

**Table 8**

**Difference on the Extent of Instructional Performance of Faculty as Perceived by Themselves and the Students**

| Teaching Area | Compared Group | Mean | Mean Difference | t- value | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commitment | Faculty | 4.61 | -0.77** | -12.547 | .000 |
| | Students | 3.84 | | | |
| Knowledge of Subject | Faculty | 4.48 | -0.56** | -6.776 | .000 |
| | Students | 3.92 | | | |
| Teaching for independent learning | Faculty | 4.61 | -0.70** | -7.130 | .000 |
| | Students | 3.92 | | | |
| Management of Learning | Faculty | 4.54 | -0.59** | -6.130 | .000 |
| | Students | 3.95 | | | |

\* -significant at 0.01 level

The ratings given by the set of respondents were significantly different, to mean that the ratings given by the faculty were significantly higher than those given by the students.

**Use of Teaching Strategies**

The t- test for paired samples was used in determining the difference between the perception of the students and faculty themselves, on the faculty extent of use of teaching strategies.

It could be gleaned in Table 9 that the faculty rated their extent of use of teaching strategies higher than the students as revealed in the mean of 3.95 and 3.86, respectively. This generates a mean difference of 0.09. The t-value of 1.623 and significance 0.115 is greater than the .05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted. That is the faculty and students have the same level of perceptions on the instructors' use of teaching strategies.

**Table 9**

**Difference on the Extent of Use of Teaching Strategies as Perceived by the Faculty Themselves and the Students**

| Compared Group | Mean | Mean Difference | T- Value | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Faculty* | 3.95 | | | |
| | | 0.09 | 1.623 | 0.115 |
| *Students* | 3.86 | | | |

ns – not significant

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

### CONCLUSION

From the foregoing findings, the following conclusions are forwarded:

1. The faculty respondents are predominantly male, married, and a mixture of young and old teachers, with 40 percent belonging to the 31 to 40 years old bracket, who have endeavored to earn units towards the Master in Education programs and had finished the program. A good number had enrolled above the masters' program. They are generally qualified to teach in college. Majority had been teaching their major fields of specialization as most of them had finished hard technology courses in college. Some are still new in the service but more than majority had been in the service for over ten years with some who had served for over 30 years. The faculty of the university are qualified to teach their subject assignments as they are educationally qualified and had tried to meet the minimum requirements set by CHED to be able to teach in college.

2. As regards methods of teaching, the use of the demonstration method, discussion, lecture, laboratory method and project methods were rated as 'very much use' especially as rated by the faculty.

3. Along level of instructional performance of faculty, the faculty and the student differed on their perceptions such as faculty rated themselves outstanding but only very satisfactory as viewed by the students.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based from the foregoing findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. The university should encourage faculty members to update their competencies and skills through attendance to trainings sponsored by other agencies and those initiated by the university to enhance their competencies.

2. There are newer teaching strategies such as the use of state-of-the-art gadgets and equipment so as to keep the learners updated and abreast such as in electronics, carpentry and other areas which need to be revisited.

3. The author recommends that further studies will be conducted by other researchers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almoite, Pablo C. (2001) "Technology and Home
　Economics (THE) Program of the Secondary Schools of Bacnotan Division of La Union, San Fernando City La Union, Master Thesis

Baligat, Jr.Manuel H.(2008) "Effectiveness of Technology and Livelihood Education Program in the Department of Education in Camanava Area: Inputs for Curriculum Development", Dissertation, Technological University of the Philippines Manila

Bigge (1976), Ward teaching skills: An investigation into the behavioural characteristics of effective ward teachers. Retrieved from:　https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/154424845.pdf

Bustos, Alicia S. et. al. Psychological, Anthropological Foundations of Education. Katha Publishing Co. Inc.,1996

Cardon, P. (2000), At -Risks Students and Technology Education: A Qualitative Study, Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242724426_At-Risk_Students_and_Technology_Education_ A_Qualitative_ Study

Cruz, Lilia D. (2005), Technology Education Teachers' Needs Satisfaction and the Holding Power of Selected Private Schools in Quezon City" Master Thesis, Technological University of the Philippines Manila

Camarao, Fedeserio C. Technology Education in the Philippines, Manila Philippine National Bookstore & Printing Press, Inc., 1991.

De Asis, Werson R. (2007), "Technology Awareness and Management Competence of Technology Instructional Leaders and Technology and Livelihood Education Teacher's Performance in the Public Secondary Schools in DepEd Manila", Dissertation, Technological University of the Philippines Manila

Gahite, Wilma M. (2003), "School Managers' Administrative and Supervisory Functions, their impact on Teacher's Performance and Pupil Achievement in the Division of Laguna, Dissertation, TUP

Malig, Jerry P. (2001), "DMMMSU Industrial Training Program", Dissertation, DMMMSU Graduate College, San Fernando City, La Union, Master Thesis, DMMMSU Graduate College, San Fernando City La　Union

Morales, M. & De Vera A. (2021), Acquisition and Practice of Technical Skills Among Grade 10 TLE Students, Southeast Asian Journal of Science and Technology, Vol.6, Issue 1

Navarro, Ma. Lourdes C. (2008), "Time Management Practices, Job Performance and satisfaction of Technology and Livelihood Education –Home Economics (TLE-HE) Teachers in the Division of　City Schools, Manila," Dissertation, Technological University of the Philippines

Paborada, M. N., & Valencerina, R. D. (2019). Competencies in Home Economics of Grade 10 Students in Mangatarem District. *PSU Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *2*(1), 56-65.　Retrieved　from https://psurj.org/psurj/online/index.php/mrj/article/ view/130

The Philippine Star, "The four levels of Learning", December 4,2010

The Teacher's Magazine, The Philippine Journal of Education volume LXXXIII no.2, July 2004

King, Kenneth (2008), A Technical and Vocational Education and Training Strategy for　UNESCO.　Retrieved　from https://www.edc.org/sites/default/files/uploads/Technical-Vocational-Education-Training-Report.pdf