

Educational Philosophy and Teaching Style of Language and Literature (LL) Teachers

Jude Renan Bido^{1*}

Article Information

Received: July 28, 2025

Accepted: September 02, 2025

Published: September 29, 2025

Keywords

Educational Philosophy, Language and Literature Teachers, Teaching Style

ABSTRACT

This study examined the educational philosophies and teaching styles of Language and Literature (LL) teachers in Northern Samar, with the aim of describing the relationship between teachers' philosophical orientations and their instructional practices. A descriptive-quantitative research design was employed, using a standardized survey conveniently responded by 20 LL teachers. The data were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and cross-tabulation. Results revealed that the respondents are mostly female, predominantly female, young to mid-career, moderately experienced, and academically well-prepared. Moreover, the majority of teachers adhered to Progressivism (55%), reflecting a learner-centered orientation that emphasizes inquiry, experiential learning, and democratic participation. Existentialism (20%) and Eclecticism (15%) followed, while Essentialism and Perennialism were minimally represented (5% each). In terms of teaching styles, the Delegator (40%) emerged as the most dominant, followed by teachers who employed a Combination of styles (25%), the Personal Model (20%), the Expert (10%), and the Authority (5%) approach. Cross-tabulation indicated a strong alignment between Progressivist philosophy and Delegator/Personal Model styles, while existentialist teachers balanced between Delegator and Expert orientations. Eclectic teachers demonstrated corresponding flexibility in their teaching styles. The findings suggest that LL teachers largely reflect global and national educational trends favoring student-centered and flexible pedagogies, while the limited presence of teacher-centered approaches signals a gradual decline of traditionalist models. It is recommended that professional development programs emphasize inquiry-based and collaborative learning strategies; curriculum implementation support eclectic practices to address diverse learners' needs; DepEd and CHED sustain policies encouraging postgraduate studies to enhance teachers' philosophical and pedagogical maturity; and further studies be conducted in the province and across different regions to validate and expand these findings.

INTRODUCTION

The role of educational philosophy in shaping teaching styles has been a subject of extensive scholarly inquiry. Broadly, an educational philosophy encompasses a teacher's beliefs and values regarding the nature of learning, the purpose of education, and the methods of instruction (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). These philosophies, ranging from perennialism and essentialism to progressivism and reconstructionism, directly influence how educators approach their pedagogical practices (Sadker & Sadker, 2017).

Within the specific context of language and literature education, the alignment between a teacher's educational philosophy and their teaching style is particularly critical. Language and literature, as subjects, are inherently interpretive and culturally embedded, requiring educators to navigate complex issues of meaning, context, and value (паркер, 2019). Teachers' philosophical orientations can significantly impact their instructional choices, affecting everything from curriculum design to classroom management (Winch, 2020).

Previous research has highlighted the diverse ways in which educational philosophies manifest in teaching styles. For instance, a study by Tippett and Lee (2019) found that teachers who adhere to a progressivist philosophy are more likely to employ student-centered activities,

such as group projects and discussions, to foster critical thinking and collaboration. Conversely, teachers with an essentialist philosophy tend to prioritize direct instruction and standardized assessments to ensure students acquire a common core of knowledge (Şahin, 2018).

In the Philippine context, the interplay between educational philosophy and teaching style is shaped by unique cultural and historical factors. The Philippine educational system, influenced by American and Spanish colonial legacies, reflects a blend of traditional and progressive educational ideals (Valleser & Casiro, 2025; Dacumos, 2015). This hybridity presents both opportunities and challenges for language and literature teachers as they negotiate competing philosophical orientations in their practice (Durban & Catalan, 2012).

Despite the existing body of knowledge, there remains a need for more nuanced investigations into the specific educational philosophies and teaching styles prevalent among language and literature teachers. Existing studies often provide broad generalizations, failing to capture the complexities and contextual variations that characterize actual classroom practice (Reyes, 2020). Furthermore, there is a dearth of research that explores the alignment between teachers' espoused philosophies and their enacted teaching styles, particularly in the Philippine setting.

¹ University of Eastern Philippines, Philippines

* Corresponding author's e-mail: juderenan@gmail.com

This research study aims to address these gaps by examining the educational philosophies and teaching styles of language and literature (LL) teachers. This study seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of how teachers' beliefs and values shape their teaching style and their interaction.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed a descriptive research design to examine the educational philosophies and teaching styles of Language and Literature (LL) teachers. The research instrument consisted of three major parts: (1) the profile of respondents (sex, age, years in service, teaching position, and highest educational attainment); (2) the Educational Philosophy Survey developed by Tamayao (2019) and originally adapted from Sadker and Sadker (1997); and (3) the Teaching Style Survey based on Grasha and Reichmann's (2004) framework. Data were collected through convenience sampling, wherein a Google Form was distributed via the researcher's social media account. The survey post specifically invited participation from LL teachers, both in English and Filipino, across the basic education level. A total of 20 teachers responded and were included in the study. All participants were actively teaching language and literature-related subjects in the basic education sector at the time of the survey.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

The demographic profile of the respondents reveals several notable trends.

Sex. The teaching force is overwhelmingly female (95%), with only one male respondent (5%). This finding is consistent with national and global patterns in the teaching profession, where women dominate the field, particularly in language and literature (Bernardo, 2017; UNESCO, 2019). Bongco and Ancho, (2020) have also observed that teaching remains one of the most feminized professions in the Philippines, often attributed to gendered expectations of teaching as an extension of women's nurturing roles.

Age. The respondents were mostly young to mid-career teachers, with the largest group between 28–31 years old (30%), followed closely by 32–35 years old (25%) and 36–39 years old (25%). Only one respondent was in the 44–47 age group. This suggests that the teaching

workforce in this sample is relatively young, which may indicate both recent recruitment and active participation in professional growth. Comparable findings by Corpuz and Salandanan (2015) showed that younger teachers often bring innovation and enthusiasm into teaching, particularly in student-centered approaches, though they may lack the classroom management maturity of more experienced colleagues.

Years in Service. Most respondents had 9–12 years of teaching experience (30%), with a significant proportion also in the 5–8 years (20%) and 13–16 years (20%) brackets. This distribution indicates a moderately experienced workforce, with only a small percentage (10%) at the high end of the spectrum (17–20 years). This aligns with observations by Tuazon (2020), who noted that Philippine teachers typically stabilize in their careers within the first decade of service, after which some transition into higher education or administrative roles. The relatively low representation of teachers with more than 20 years of service may reflect retirement, promotion, or reassignment to non-teaching positions.

Teaching Position. Half of the respondents held the rank of Teacher III (50%), followed by Teacher II (20%) and Teacher I (20%), while only 10% were Master Teacher I. The dominance of Teacher III suggests that many respondents are already in mid-level positions, reflecting both experience and pursuit of career advancement. This distribution mirrors the findings of Salazar (2018), who highlighted that many language and literature teachers in the Philippines achieve rapid promotion through continuous professional development and graduate studies.

Highest Educational Attainment. Nearly all respondents pursued education beyond the baccalaureate level: 45% held master's degrees, 35% had master's units, and 10% had begun doctoral studies. Only two respondents (10%) held only a bachelor's degree. This high level of graduate study engagement is consistent with the Department of Education's continuing professional development requirements and incentives for promotion (DepEd Order No. 66, s. 2007). Similar findings were reported by David, Reyes, Miranda, Nalipay, Ancho, and Roxas (2020), who emphasized that teachers in the Philippines increasingly invest in graduate studies to strengthen pedagogical competence, enhance research engagement, and improve promotion opportunities.

Table 1: Profile of the Respondents

Profile Variables		Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Male	19	95
	Female	1	5
	Total	20	100
Age	44-47	1	5
	40-43	3	15
	36-39	5	25
	32-35	5	25

	28-31		6	30
	Total		20	100
Years in Service	17-20		2	10
	13-16		4	20
	9-12		6	30
	5-8		4	20
	1-4		4	20
	Total		20	100
Teaching Position	Master Teacher 1		2	10
	Teacher III		10	50
	Teacher II		4	20
	Teacher I		4	20
	Total		20	100
Highest Educational Attainment	Baccalaureate Degree		2	10
	With Units in Master's Degree		7	35
	Master's Degree		9	45
	Doctorate Units		2	10
	Total		20	100

Educational Philosophy of the Language and Literature (LL) Teachers

The results indicate that the majority of the respondents adhere to Progressivism (55%), followed by Existentialism (20%). A smaller proportion of teachers demonstrated Eclectic orientations (15%), while Essentialism (5%) and Perennialism (5%) were the least favored. The dominance of Progressivism suggests that language and literature teachers in Northern Samar generally value student-centered learning, critical thinking, and problem-solving approaches. According to Sadker and Sadker (1997), progressivist educators emphasize experiential learning, democratic classrooms, and the development of skills necessary for real-world problem solving. This finding aligns with Tamayao (2019), who found that Filipino teachers often lean toward progressivist philosophies due to curriculum reforms such as the K-12 Basic Education Program, which encourages inquiry-based and competency-driven instruction.

The presence of Existentialist teachers (20%) highlights an emphasis on student choice, individuality, and authentic self-expression. This is particularly relevant to language and literature, where personal engagement and interpretation play central roles. As Sadker and Sadker (1997) note, existentialism promotes learner autonomy and responsibility for one's own learning. Tamayao (2019) similarly emphasized that existentialist tendencies among Filipino educators reflect a response to diverse learners' needs and the recognition of personal freedom in education.

Interestingly, 15% of respondents adopted an eclectic philosophy, suggesting that some teachers draw from multiple frameworks rather than adhering strictly to one. This may reflect practical realities of classroom teaching, where teachers integrate different philosophical approaches

to address curriculum demands and diverse student needs (Tamayao, 2019). The relatively low endorsement of Essentialism (5%) and Perennialism (5%) indicates that traditional, subject-centered philosophies are less dominant among the respondents. Essentialism emphasizes mastery of core subjects and teacher authority, while Perennialism focuses on classical works and timeless truths (Sadker & Sadker, 1997). Previous studies (Tamayao, 2019; Salandanan, 2015) found similar patterns, reporting that while essentialist elements remain in Philippine classrooms (e.g., standardized testing, rote learning), many teachers prefer more flexible, learner-centered philosophies.

When compared with earlier studies, these results reinforce the trend toward progressivist and eclectic philosophies among Filipino teachers. Tamayao (2019) noted that progressivism resonates with teachers because of its alignment with Philippine educational reforms that emphasize outcomes-based education. At the same time, the presence of eclectic orientations highlights the adaptability of teachers in negotiating philosophical ideals with real classroom challenges. The findings suggest that the LL teacher-respondents are philosophically aligned with student-centered approaches, emphasizing learning as a dynamic, interactive, and personalized process. This orientation may be particularly advantageous in language and literature teaching, where fostering creativity, critical literacy, and reflective thinking are essential outcomes.

Teaching Style of the Language and Literature (LL) Teachers

The findings reveal that the most dominant teaching style among the respondents is the Delegator style (40%), followed by teachers who use a combination of styles (25%). Other styles include Personal Model (20%), Expert (10%), and Authority (5%).

Table 2: Educational Philosophy of the Respondents

Educational Philosophy	Frequency	Percentage
Progressivism	11	55
Existentialism	4	20
Eclectic	3	15
Essentialism	1	5
Perennialism	1	5
Total	20	100

The preference for the Delegator style suggests that teachers favor student autonomy, independence, and responsibility for learning. In this style, teachers act more as facilitators, guiding students to explore and construct knowledge on their own. Sadker and Sadker (1997) emphasize that delegator teachers promote problem-solving, group projects, and learner accountability, aligning closely with progressivist and existentialist educational philosophies, which were also dominant in this study's findings. This resonates with Tamayao (2014), who argued that Filipino teachers often lean toward student-centered methods as these approaches reflect both global educational trends and local curriculum reforms that encourage learner participation and active engagement.

The second most common orientation was the use of a combination of styles (25%), reflecting an eclectic approach to teaching. This indicates that many teachers do not adhere strictly to one style but rather adjust their teaching methods depending on learners' needs, subject matter, or classroom situations. This pragmatic orientation has also been documented in Tamayao's (2019) work, which found that teachers in the Philippines often adopt eclectic strategies to balance the tension between curriculum demands and diverse learner characteristics.

The Personal Model style (20%) indicates that some teachers prefer to demonstrate skills and values for students to emulate. According to Sadker and Sadker (1997), this style allows teachers to act as role models, encouraging learners to observe and replicate processes. In language and literature teaching, this may manifest in modeling reading strategies, writing techniques, or literary analysis. Salandanan (2015) have also observed that modeling remains a powerful strategy in teaching communication and critical thinking skills.

Meanwhile, fewer respondents identified with the Expert (10%) and Authority (5%) styles. These teacher-centered orientations emphasize content mastery, discipline, and control. Their low representation suggests a shift away from traditional pedagogical approaches, consistent with the decline of essentialist and perennialist philosophies among the same group of teachers. Corpuz and Salandanan (2015), and Tamayao (2014) similarly observed that while traditional approaches persist in some contexts (e.g., standardized testing and lecture-based classes), many Filipino educators are moving toward learner-centered instruction.

Table 3: Teaching Style of the Respondent Language and Literature Teachers

Teaching Style	Frequency	Percentage
Delegator	8	40
Combination	5	25
Personal Model	4	20
Expert	2	10
Authority	1	5
Total	20	100

Cross-Tabulation of the Educational Philosophy and Teaching Style of the Language and Literature (LL) Teachers

The cross-tabulation of educational philosophy and teaching style provides deeper insights into how teachers' guiding beliefs influence their classroom practices. Results show that Progressivism is strongly associated with the Delegator (n=4) and Personal Model (n=4) teaching styles, as well as a smaller number combining multiple styles (n=2). Existentialist teachers also tend to adopt the Delegator (n=2) and Expert (n=1) styles, while Eclectic teachers spread across Delegator (n=2) and Combination (n=1). Meanwhile, Essentialism is linked to the Delegator style (n=1), and Perennialism to Combination (n=1).

The data reveal a strong alignment between Progressivism and the Delegator and Personal Model styles, highlighting a consistent student-centered approach. Progressivism, as emphasized by Sadker and Sadker (1997), values experiential learning, inquiry, and critical thinking. Teachers who subscribe to this philosophy are more likely to encourage learner autonomy (Delegator) or serve as role models of inquiry and performance (Personal Model). Tamayao (2014) similarly found that progressivist Filipino teachers frequently employ interactive and participatory strategies, reflecting reforms such as K-12 that prioritize skills-based, collaborative learning. This finding aligns with previous research by Salandanan (2015), who noted that language and literature teachers often combine modeling with student-centered practices, as both strategies help learners engage critically with texts while developing their own interpretive voices.

Teachers with Existentialist philosophies were linked with Delegator (n=2) and Expert (n=1) styles. This suggests that while many existentialist teachers emphasize learner independence, some still rely on the Expert role to guide students in their pursuit of personal meaning. Sadker and Sadker (1997) describe existentialism as valuing individuality, freedom, and authentic learning choices. Tamayao (2014) likewise observed that Filipino teachers with existentialist leanings balance freedom with structured expertise, acknowledging the need for guidance while allowing students room to self-direct.

The Eclectic philosophy was associated with both Delegator and Combination teaching styles, reflecting flexibility and adaptability. This supports Tamayao's (2019) assertion that many Filipino teachers employ

eclectic approaches to respond to curriculum demands and learner diversity. Eclectic teachers' willingness to combine methods also mirrors Sadker and Sadker's (1997) view that effective teachers often integrate multiple philosophies to best serve their students. The few teachers who identified with Essentialism and Perennialism showed minimal associations, with Essentialism linked to the Delegator style (n=1) and Perennialism to Combination (n=1). Traditionally,

essentialists and perennialists are associated with teacher-centered, structured approaches (Sadker & Sadker, 1997). However, the data suggest that even those who hold these philosophies have shifted toward more student-centered or flexible teaching styles. This reflects broader trends in Philippine education, where reforms have reduced reliance on rote learning and traditional lecture styles (Tamayao, 2019; Corpuz & Salandanan, 2015).

Table 3: Result of the Cross-Tabulation of the Educational Philosophy and Teaching Style of the Language and Literature (LL) Teachers

	Delegator	Combination	Personal Model	Expert	Authority
Progressivism	4	2	4		1
Existentialism	2	1		1	
Eclectic	2	1			
Essentialism	1				
Perennialism		1			
Total	9	5	4	1	1

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the language and literature (LL) teachers surveyed are predominantly young to mid-career females holding mid-level teaching positions and advanced degrees, indicating a workforce that is both academically engaged and committed to professional growth. Philosophically, the majority subscribe to Progressivism, emphasizing student-centered, inquiry-based, and experiential learning, which aligns with their dominant Delegator and Personal Model teaching styles. The cross-tabulation further reinforces this alignment, showing that progressivist teachers frequently adopt facilitative and modeling approaches, while existentialist and eclectic teachers also lean toward learner autonomy and flexibility. These results imply that language and literature instruction in the context studied is shifting toward participatory and skills-based pedagogies, consistent with K–12 reforms and global trends in 21st-century education. However, the limited representation of traditional philosophies and teacher-centered styles suggests potential gaps in ensuring mastery of foundational knowledge and structured content delivery. Therefore, it is recommended that professional development programs continue to strengthen student-centered practices while also integrating balanced strategies that address both learner autonomy and content mastery, ensuring holistic development in language and literature education.

REFERENCES

Bernardo, A. B. I. (2017). Gender, teaching experience, and teaching efficacy of Filipino teachers. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 18(4), 541–551. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-017-9504-4>

Bongco, R. T., & Ancho, I. V. (2020). HisStory in the Feminized Teaching Profession in the Philippines. *Journal of Contemporary Eastern Asia*, 19(2).

10.17477/jcea.2020.19.2.197

Corpuz, B. B., & Salandanan, G. G. (2015). *Principles of teaching 1* (2nd ed.). Lorimar Publishing, Inc., Philippines.

Dacumos, Rory. (2015). *Philippine Colonial Education System*. 10.13140/RG.2.1.2507.7600.

David, A. P., Reyes, Z. Q., Miranda, P. A., Nalipay, M. J. N., Ancho, I. V., & Roxas, M. M. (2020). Graduate teacher education in the Philippines: Observations and prospects. *The Normal Lights*, 14(2). <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7e24/c50a6b8e77fe20807aa52f09f64c6ef24160.pdf>

Department of Education [DepEd]. (2007). DepEd Order No. 66, s. 2007: Revised guidelines on the appointment and promotion of other teaching, related teaching and non-teaching positions.

Durban, J. M., & Catalan, R. D. (2012). Issues and concerns of Philippine education through the years. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 1(2), 61-69. [http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.1\(2\)/AJSSH2012\(1.2-08\).pdf](http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.1(2)/AJSSH2012(1.2-08).pdf)

Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (1993). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. Teachers College Press.

Sadker, D. M., & Sadker, M. P. (1997). *Teachers, schools, and society* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill, USA.

Salandanan, G. G. (2015). *Teaching approaches and strategies*. Lorimar Publishing, Inc., Philippines.

Tamayao, A.I. (2019). *Embracing the Teaching Profession*. Rex Book Store Inc., Sampaloc, Manila, Philippines.

Tippett, T. P., & Lee, J. J. (2019). Looking Back to Move Forward: Understanding Progressive Education in the 21st Century. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, 8, 79-98.

Tuazon, J. A. (2020). Teachers' career trajectories in

- Philippine public schools: A mixed-methods analysis. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 3(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v3i1.115>
- UNESCO. (2019). *Global education monitoring Report—Gender Report: Building bridges for gender equality*. <https://doi.org/10.54676/QTBO2301>
- Valleser, K,H.D., & Casiro, R.B. (2025). Shaping Minds and Culture: The Cultural Impact of the American Educational System on Filipinos, 1902-1946.
- Şahin, M. (2018). Essentialism in philosophy, psychology, education, social and scientific scopes. *Journal of Innovation in Psychology, Education and Didactics*, 22(2), 193-204. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED593579.pdf>