

PROFILE AND TEACHING STYLES OF DANCE EDUCATORS IN THE PHILIPPINES

John Paul R. Domingo, MPES

ABSTRACT

This study determined the profile and teaching styles of dance educators in the Philippines. Grasha-Reichmann's Teaching Inventory Survey Questionnaire was administered to a simple random sample of 121 dance educator-respondents who participated during the 27th Annual Dance Educators Convention Seminar of the Dance Education Association of the Philippines (DEAP). The findings revealed that there were diminutive differences with regard to sex, age, highest educational attainment, level taught, total number of teaching year's experience, number of years teaching dance, and dance expertise while there were large differences in terms of employment status, type of school, and highest level of dance training. Dance educator-respondents predominantly used the 'expert' teaching style while 'delegator' teaching style as the least employed. Results also showed that the 'formal authority' ($F= 7.807$, $p= .001$), 'personal model' ($F= 4.702$, $p= .011$), and 'delegator' ($F= 5.779$, $p= .004$) teaching styles differed significantly when grouped according to level taught.

Keywords: Dance educator-respondents, profile, teaching styles

INTRODUCTION

Profile and Teaching Styles of Dance Educators in the Philippines

Dance educators are indeed very important part of an educational system, each of which is unique in many ways. In a recent study of teaching the dance class, Mainwaring and Krasnow (2010) noted that “dance educators have varied strengths, abilities, values, personalities, and constraints that influence how they teach”. The dance educators differ from one another in such characteristic as the tendency to use certain teaching style in their instruction. In concordance, the authors also claimed that the effective teaching of dance skills is informed by a variety of individual teaching style.

Teaching style has been diversely described as teachers’ classroom behavior and their distinct approach to teaching; teaching methods, the characteristics and roles teacher’s play; one’s personality traits; archetypal forms or metaphors on teaching; the implementation of the teacher’s philosophy about teaching; and the way that various teaching approaches are combined (Grasha, 1996; Hoyt & Lee, 2002; Conti, 2004; Evans, Harkins, & Young, 2008).

In the year 2012, the Department of Education (DepEd) of the Republic of the Philippines implemented the “K to 12 Basic Education Program”. The physical education curriculum, which includes ‘Rhythms and Dance’ is based on the principle “Move to Learn, Learn to Move” with the main objective of achieving lifelong fitness (Department of Education, 2012).

The new educational dance program curriculum becomes actually an issue and problem on who, what and how to deliver in a classroom instructional process. As one directly involves in the instructional process in the classroom, the teacher occupies a strategic position in the school systems. For one, in his/her shoulders lay the responsibility of translating the curriculum into concrete learning experiences.

Curacho (2009) emphasized that the demands for improving teacher quality and for holding teachers accountable for student achievement have increased over the recent years. However, some educators and policy makers claim that there is a need to identify indicators of effectiveness and to evaluate school and teachers. One of the indicators importantly pertains to teaching styles.

Over the years, a number of researchers suggested and recommended to make studies in teaching styles. Macfadyen and Campbell (2005) emphasized that “teachers using a variety of teaching styles should be explored further”. Razak, Ahmad, and Shah (2007) concluded that the teaching style is one of the many factors that need to be considered toward student’s learning. Diaz Larenas, Moran, and Rivera (2011) and Evans, Harkins, and Young (2008) reported that there have been very few researches that focuses on teaching styles. Meyer-Looze (2011) stated that “teaching styles and its relation to the expanding learning environment is an endless research area”.

Dance Education in the Philippines

Author et al. (2010) wrote that “dance education is a part of the physical education curriculum of the Philippines, from the elementary to tertiary levels in all

states, public and private schools of the country” (p.19). Dance as one of the physical education (PE) programs is considered a significant component in the educative process as it contributes to the physical, social, moral, and intellectual development of the students.

Moreover, while the Philippines is currently utilizing the new “K to 12 Basic Education Program”, the dance education curriculum guide of the physical education program for ‘Grades 11 and 12’ is still under construction (Department of Education, 2012). Dance educators need effective, innovative, and quality means of instructional process through the use of teaching styles to produce the best results or output in terms of knowledge gained, skills acquired, and attitudes changed on the part of the learner. Hence, this study is significant for one to be in a better position to initiate remedial measures or to find a better way to improve the problem/s situation.

Information results of this study may purposively help various segments of the education and the community in terms of academic, professional, leisure, and recreational development planning and implementation not to mention the physical education dance classes – a key for the Philippines to be scholarly prominent in the world of dance education .

Teaching Styles

Grasha (1996) began a program of research to develop a conceptual model of teaching style. The main goals were to describe the stylistic qualities that teachers possessed and to offer suggestions for when and how to employ them. The author assumed that a teaching style represented a pattern of needs, beliefs, and behaviors that faculty displayed in their classroom. Styles were multi-dimensional and affected how people

presented information, interacted with students, managed classroom tasks, super-socialized students to the field, and mentored students.

Table 1
Anthony F. Grasha's Teaching Styles

STYLE	DESCRIPTION	ADVANTAGE	DISADVANTAGE
1. EXPERT	Possesses knowledge and expertise; oversees; guides, and directs learners; gains status through knowledge; focuses on facts	Knowledge and information which preceptor possesses	Knowledge and information can be overused and intimidating; may not always show underlying thought processes
2. FORMAL AUTHORITY	Possesses status among learners because of knowledge and authority/position; follows "traditions" and standards; focuses on rules and expectations for learners; supervises learners closely with critical eye toward standard practices and procedures	Focus on clear expectations and acceptable ways of doing things	Potentially rigid and less flexible ways of managing learners and their concerns
3. PERSONAL MODEL	Leads by personal example; suggests prototypes for appropriate behavior; shows learners how to do things; wants learners to observe and emulate approach	"Hands-on", emphasis on direct observation; emphasis in following a role model (mentor relationship)	Teachers want to "clone" learners in own image; learners may feel inadequate cannot live up to; stuck in practice may believe approach is best way to practice
4. FACILITATOR	Emphasizes personal nature of teaching-learning relationship; asks questions, explores options with learners; focuses on learner responsibility, independence, and initiative	Personal flexibility; Focus on learner needs and goals; openness to alternatives and options	Time consuming; sometimes more direct approach is needed; can make learner uncomfortable
5. DELEGATOR	Encourages learner responsibility and initiative when apt, goal is to have learner function autonomously; a resource person; answers questions and periodically reviews learner progress	Contribute to learners professional development and confidence; two-way trust.	Learners may not have capability to function in an autonomous manner; some learners are anxious when not supervised

METHODS

Participants

This study included the simple random sample of 121 selected dance educators in the Philippines during the Dance Education Association of the Philippines (DEAP) Incorporated - 27th Annual Dance Educators Convention-Workshop held last May 12-15, 2012 at the University of Baguio, Baguio City, Benguet.

Table 2
Distribution of Respondents per Region

Region	F	%
National Capital Region (NCR)	41	33.9
Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR)	2	1.7
Ilocos Region (Region 1)	13	10.7
Cagayan Valley (Region 2)	3	2.5
Central Luzon (Region 3)	6	5.0
Region 4-A (CALABARZON)	25	20.60
Region 4-B (MIMAROPA)	1	.8
Bicol Region (Region 5)	11	9.1
Western Visayas (Region 6)	2	1.7
Eastern Visayas (Region 8)	3	2.5
Northern Mindanao (Region 10)	1	.8
Davao Region (Region 11)	8	6.6
<u>SOCCSKSARGEN</u> (Region 12)	5	4.1
Total	121	100.0

There were no respondents from the Central Visayas (Region 7), Zambaoanga Peninsula (Region 9), CARAGA (Region 13), and Autonomous Region of

Muslim Mindanao (ARMM). The Board Secretary of the Dance Education Association of the Philippines (DEAP), (personal communication, May 15, 2012), confirmed that there were no attendees from the said regions.

Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study consisted of demographic variables (i.e., sex, age, highest educational attainment, employment status, level taught, type of school, number of teaching years experience, number of years teaching dance, highest level of dance training, related experiences, dance expertise and number of dance expertise), 40-item Grasha-Reichmann's Teaching Inventory Survey Questionnaire with 5-point Likert-type scale options: Strongly disagree (1), Disagree (2), Undecided (3), Agree (4), and Strongly agree (5), and an open-ended question of "How can we make the teaching of dance more effective and innovative?".

The teaching style inventory has a main purpose of determining the teaching style type of the respondents: expert, formal authority, personal model, facilitator, and delegator. It consists of a series of 40-item indicators that participants need to answer using a rating scale. The said instrument was validated by Grasha (1996) and was widely tested for its validity and reliability in other research applications (Coalition of Essential Schools, 2007).

Procedure

Demographic questions were structured based on the research purpose of the study. Permission was granted from one of the authors, Dr. Sheryl Riechmann

Hruska, to utilize the Teaching Inventory Survey Questionnaire. An approval note in the letter addressed to the DEAP officers indicating the research purpose and assurance of confidentiality was attached to each survey questionnaire before dissemination. The researcher prioritized the results obtained through survey questionnaire.

Data Analysis

This study utilized the descriptive method of research. Data were encoded in a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 16 (SPSS Inc., 2008). The statistical tools used in this research were descriptive statistics, frequency and percentage, weighted means, t-test, one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Tukey's Honest of Significant Difference (HSD) Post-hoc Test.

RESULTS

Demographics Data

Research Question #1: What is the profile of the dance educator-respondents in terms of sex, age, highest educational attainment, employment status, level taught, type of school, number of teaching years experience, number of years teaching dance, highest level of dance training, related experiences, dance expertise, and number of dance expertise?

Table 3 illustrates the various demographic results from this study. In terms of sex, out of 121 respondents, there were 61 females or 51.4% and 60 males or 49.6%.

Table 3
Demographics of the Dance Educator-Respondents
in the Philippines

Demographics Data	f	%
Sex		
Male	60	<i>49.6</i>
Female	61	<i>51.4</i>
Total	100.0	<i>100.0</i>
Age		
20 to 25 yrs old	16	<i>13.2</i>
26 to 30 yrs old	27	<i>22.3</i>
31 to 35 yrs old	24	<i>19.8</i>
36 to 40 yrs old	21	<i>17.4</i>
41 yrs old and above	33	<i>27.3</i>
Total	100.0	<i>100.0</i>
Highest Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's degree	25	<i>20.7</i>
With master's units	55	<i>45.5</i>
Master's degree	26	<i>21.5</i>
With Doctorate units	6	<i>5.0</i>
Doctorate degree	9	<i>7.4</i>
Total	100.0	<i>100.0</i>
Employment Status		
Permanent	98	<i>81.0</i>
Probationary	14	<i>11.6</i>
Contractual	9	<i>7.4</i>
Total	100.0	<i>100.0</i>
Level Taught		
Elementary	34	<i>28.1</i>
Secondary (High school)	41	<i>33.9</i>
Tertiary	36	<i>29.8</i>
Both elementary and tertiary	1	<i>0.8</i>
Both secondary and tertiary	6	<i>5.0</i>
Freelance	1	<i>0.8</i>
Freelance but with tertiary teaching	1	<i>0.8</i>
Total	100.0	<i>100.0</i>

Demographics Data	f	%
Type of School		
Public	86	71.1
Private	34	28.1
Not applicable	1	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0
Highest Level of Dance Training		
International	26	21.5
National	95	78.5
Total	100.0	100.0
Number of Teaching Years Experience		
1 to 5 yrs	40	33.1
6 to 10 yrs	29	24.0
11 to 15 yrs	0	0
16 to 20 yrs	14	11.6
21 to 25 yrs	13	10.7
26 to 30 yrs	25	20.7
Total	100.0	100.0
<i>Weighted Mean = 12.1 years</i>		
Number of Years Teaching Dance		
1 to 5 yrs	47	38.8
6 to 10 yrs	28	23.1
11 to 15 yrs	0	0
16 to 20 yrs	16	13.2
21 to 25 yrs	11	9.1
26 to 30 yrs	18	14.9
No response	1	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0
<i>Weighted Mean = 10.7 years</i>		
Related Experiences*		
Athlete	38	31.4
Sports coordinator	32	24.6
Performing Artist	65	53.7
Official	44	36.4
Coach	57	47.1
Others: Choreographer	2	1.7
Cultural coordinator	1	0.8
Music coordinator	1	0.8
Moderator	1	0.8
Designer	1	0.8
Dance Expertise*		
Folk dance	92	76.0
Social/Ballroom dance	57	47.1
Recreational dance	32	26.4
Creative rhythms	25	20.7
Creative dance	44	36.4
No responses	1	0.8
Number of Dance Expertise		
Single	59	48.8
Dual	23	19.0
Multiple	38	31.4
No response	1	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0

* Multiple responses allowed

The findings revealed that there were small differences with regard to sex, age, highest educational attainment, level taught, total number of teaching year's experience, and number of years teaching dance while there were sizeable differences in terms of employment status, type of school, highest level of dance training, and dance expertise. Expressly, in terms of employment status, 98 respondents or 81% were permanent, while, 14 respondents or 11.6% were probationary and only 9 respondents or 7.4% were contractual. In terms of type of school, 86 respondents or 71.1% were mostly teaching in public schools, whereas, 34 respondents or 28.1% were teaching in private schools and 1 respondent or 0.8% was teaching in a non-academic institution.

In terms of highest level of dance training, 95 or 78.5% trained nationally, while, only 25 respondents or 21.5% trained internationally. In terms of dance expertise, folk dance ranked first as stated by 92 respondents or 76%, while, social/ballroom dance ranked second as mentioned by 57 respondents or 47.1%, followed by creative dance, recreation dance, and creative rhythms, consecutively.

Questionnaire Data

Research Question #2: What are the agreed teaching styles among the dance educators in the Philippines?

As shown in Table 4, 'Expert' teaching style ranked 1st with an over-all mean of 4.19 interpreted as 'agree'. 'Facilitator' teaching style ranked 2nd with an over-all mean of 4.10 interpreted as 'agree'. 'Delegator' teaching style, however, appeared at the last rank with an over-all mean of 3.99 of which also interpreted as 'agree'. The statistics reveals that all the dance

educator-respondents agreed on all the statement-indicators of the five teaching style variables.

Table 4
Summary of Results Based on the Over-all Mean of Teaching Style Indicators

Teaching Style Variables	Over-all Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Expert	4.19	<i>Agree</i>	1
Formal Authority	4.02	<i>Agree</i>	4
Personal Model	4.09	<i>Agree</i>	3
Facilitator	4.10	<i>Agree</i>	2
Delegator	3.99	<i>Agree</i>	5

Research Question #3: *Is there a significant difference between the dance educator-respondents' teaching styles when grouped according to: sex, age, highest educational attainment, employment status, level taught, type of school, number of teaching years experience, number of years teaching dance, highest level of dance training, related experiences, dance expertise, and number of dance expertise?*

Results of the study revealed that there were no significant differences between dance educator-respondents' teaching styles when grouped by sex, age, highest educational attainment, employment status, type of school, number of teaching years experience, number of years teaching dance, highest level of dance training, related experiences, and dance expertise and number of dance expertise.

However, there were significant differences in the dance educator-respondents' teaching styles when grouped according to level taught, specifically, in 'formal authority' ($F=7.807$, $p = .001$), 'personal model' ($F=4.702$, $p = .011$), and 'delegator' ($F=5.779$, $p = .004$) teaching styles, thus, rejected the null hypothesis of this study that there is no significant difference between the dance educators' teaching styles when grouped according to level taught.

Table 5
Significance of Difference in the Teaching Styles of the Dance Educator-Respondents When Grouped by Level Taught

Teaching Style Variables	F	Sig.	Result	Decision on H_0
Expert	2.512	.086	NS	Do not reject H_0
Formal authority	7.807	.001**	S	Reject H_0
Personal model	4.702	.011*	S	Reject H_0
Facilitator	2.816	.064	NS	Do not reject H_0
Delegator	5.779	.004**	S	Reject H_0

S – Significant

*Significant at the $p < .05$

NS = Not significant

**Significant at the $p < .01$

A deeper analysis of this study is shown in Table 6 using Tukey's Honest Significant Difference (HSD) Post Hoc Analysis on significant difference.

Table 6 shows the significance of difference in the 'formal authority', 'personal model', and 'delegator' teaching styles when grouped by level taught. In terms of 'formal authority' teaching style, there is no significant difference between secondary

and tertiary levels (Mean difference= 0.189, $p = .441$), and so, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

However, the statistics revealed that between elementary and high school levels (Mean difference= 0-.606, $p = .001$), as well as, elementary and tertiary levels (Mean difference= -0.419, $p = .037$) found to be significantly different, hence, rejecting the null hypothesis.

Table 6
Tukey's HSD Post Hoc Analysis on the
Significance of Difference in the Teaching Styles
When Grouped by Level Taught

Post Hoc Comparison		Mean diff.	Sig.	Results	Decision on H_0
Formal Authority					
Elementary	Secondary	-0.606	.001**	S	Reject H_0
Elementary	Tertiary	-0.419	.037*	S	Reject H_0
Secondary	Tertiary	0.189	.441	NS	Do not reject H_0
Personal Model					
Elementary	Secondary	-0.602	.008**	S	Reject H_0
Elementary	Tertiary	-0.310	.281	NS	Do not reject H_0
Secondary	Tertiary	0.292	.290	NS	Do not reject H_0
Delegator					
Elementary	Secondary	-0.593	.003**	S	Reject H_0
Elementary	Tertiary	-0.362	.115	NS	Do not reject H_0
Secondary	Tertiary	0.231	.376	NS	Do not reject H_0

S – Significant
NS – Not significant

*Significant at the $p < .05$
**Significant at the $p < .01$

It was also found to be significantly different between elementary and secondary levels (Mean difference= -0.602, $p = .008$) in terms of ‘personal model’ teaching style and significantly different between elementary and secondary levels (Mean difference= -0.593, $p = .003$) in terms of ‘delegator’ teaching style, hence, both rejecting the null hypothesis.

Research Question #4: *What suggestions were given by the dance educator-respondents to enhance the effectiveness and innovativeness of teaching dance?*

Table 7
Suggestions Given by the Respondents on How to Enhance the Effectiveness and Innovativeness When Teaching Dance
 N = 121

Suggestions*	f	%	Rank
Attendance to seminar-workshops, continuing development programs, professional development, etc.	30	24.8	3
Involvement in the conduct of research, and/or apply the research findings in the teaching of dance	13	10.7	7
Actual participation in dance such as performances, recitals, and the like	16	13.2	4
Improving the pedagogical aspect	41	33.9	2
Infusing/utilization of technology in the teaching of dance	15	12.4	5
Strengthening values and attitudes, and becoming more student-centered	46	38.0	1
Strengthening/Supporting dance programs (fundamentals, curricula instruction, facilities, materials, etc.	14	11.6	6

* Multiple responses allowed

DISCUSSION

This study ascertained the profile and teaching styles of dance educators in the Philippines. Statistical data results of this study are consistent with Grasha (1996) who conducted a lot of researches about teaching styles that 'expert' and 'facilitator' teaching styles are mostly utilized by the faculty in the areas of arts, of which it includes dance education.

One interesting revelation of this study is the consideration that not all teachers employ one teaching style and one is predominant over the other. Based on the result, it is a query under what level/s taught did 'formal authority', 'personal model' and 'delegator' teaching styles become significantly different. For the past years, a number of researchers reported certain findings regarding teaching styles in the diverse academic levels. Davis-Langston (2012) study's revealed that there was no significant relationship between educators and their teaching styles in the elementary levels. Meyer-Looze (2011) research exposed that there was a low relationship between high school teachers and the 'delegator' teaching style ($r = -0.020$) in the high school levels. Diaz Larenas et al. (2011) reported that public high school teachers use more of a 'facilitator' teaching style, while, private high school teachers demonstrate more of a 'formal authority' teaching style. Aguda et al. (2009) exposed that the 'facilitator' is the most common teaching style used in the tertiary level content based subjects. Razak et al. (2007) divulged that 'expert', 'personal model', and 'delegator' teaching styles were the predominant teaching styles of the high school levels teachers.

Results also demonstrate that secondary and tertiary teachers espouse formal authority more than elementary teachers and of why secondary teachers are more personal model and delegator oriented than

elementary and tertiary teachers? According to Diaz Larenas et al. (2011), most of the high school teachers who employ these styles expected to occur in larger classes. It appears that personal model and delegator teaching styles usage depends on the learning environment. Support discussion was given by Razak et al. (2007) that ‘personal model’ and ‘delegator’ teaching styles are more teacher-initiated in nature. In line with the research- based statements, Grasha (1996) mentioned that “hands-on” of personal model teaching style and delegating task like small-group activity, discussions, and the like will help facilitate learning in a large number of students.

Land (n.d.), wrote that teaching preschool and elementary requires the teacher to take on the role of facilitator because it is more of a “student-centered” style. This is also coherent to the findings of Grasha (1996) that ‘facilitator’ teaching style’ is more a student-centered style that fosters autonomous learning, initiative, and encourages students to make decisions based on their criteria and thinking. Since elementary level emphasizes exploration, the ‘facilitator’ teaching style is more likely to be utilized.

Furthermore, in line with the suggestions of the dance educator-respondents on how the teaching of dance will become more effective and innovative when teaching dance, Florido (2006) mentioned that “there are a lot of practices in the Philippine schools that have worked through the years”. The author enumerated some of the best teachers’ programs, practices, projects, and training in the country, namely: (1) Training of Teachers on the Use of Multimedia Materials, (2) Materials Development, (3) Teaching Training, (4) Forum in Best Practices on the Use of Information Communication Technology in Teaching and Learning, (5) Strong Republic Schools Distance Learning Program, (6) Curriculum Enhancement, (7) Bridge Program such as

the development of learning competencies, distribution of materials, and pilot implementation, (8) Population Education such as training teachers and school heads, (9) Special Programs such as video materials development, citizenship advancement, finalization of modules, testing teaching training, and (10) Professional Development.

CONCLUSION

Dance educators in the Philippines regardless of status encompass diverse individuals. Elaborately, dance education is nowadays equally taught by both male and female without age limitations. Dance educators are products of academic institutions of which most of them pursue graduate studies and engage to professional trainings nationally but have limited internationally. In addition, most of the dance educators are performing artists with permanent employment status having single dance expertise, principally folk dance, predominantly distributed in the different grade levels of public schools.

The findings of this study emphasize that dance educators do not only utilize one (1) teaching style, rather a range of teaching styles. Each teaching style reflects to be dominant to one another and the variations may lead to an effective learning environment. Results show that ‘expert’ teaching style is the predominant teaching style of the dance educator-respondents. However, it appears that ‘facilitator’ teaching style is mostly suggested by the different authors cited in this study of which is dedicated to positive learning environment and creating difference on students’ lives.

Dance educators in the Philippines only differ in teaching styles when grouped by level taught. The dance teachers in elementary grade levels predominantly use the ‘facilitator’ teaching style which is a learner-centered, directed on student-teacher interaction, however,

secondary grade levels dance educators mostly utilize ‘formal authority’, ‘personal model’, and ‘delegator’ teaching styles that are characterized by teacher-centered or teacher-initiated in nature. Moreover, the dance educators in tertiary grade levels exhibit more of a ‘formal authority’ among other teaching styles.

Dance educators engage themselves in various professional activities such as participation in professional growth and development like trainings and the like, research, utilization of technology, pedagogical enrichment, dance programs and performances. Strengthening values and attitudes, and becoming more student-centered should also be given importance to meet the demands of the students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study reveals the teaching style/s of the dance educators in the Philippines. Dance educators should engage in international dance trainings for additional dance expertise as well as to finish graduate studies for professional growth and development through the assistance of educational authorities of the Philippine government. Continual professional engagements and participation in dance performances and programs will merit effective and innovative dance educators. In addition, it is also imperative to address the Department of Education and Commission on Higher Education to make the teachers’ profile the focal point for dance education programs, since it serves as the foundation for changes in the learning outcomes of students.

Dance educators should develop their own teaching style according to level taught. It is important to consider that teaching style should be linked according to student characteristics. Providing a wide range of

teaching styles would generate appropriate learning and teaching experiences.

Academic institutions that offer dance programs should give emphasis to student-centered instruction approach while it is also important to acknowledge the key role that teachers contribute in the diversity process and complexity of dance education. Teaching styles must be linked with the students' learning styles to achieve better effective instruction and curriculum. Understanding the different learners of today in the age of technology is another area to be studied to produce optimal or maximum outcome.

Administrators and department heads should spearhead to conduct researches, utilization of modern technology, professional engagement and development in relation to dance education. Higher academic authorities should also assign teachers to their respective areas of specialization where they are academically prepared for to make the teaching of dance more effective and innovative.

Attitude and values should also be given weight and consideration in teaching the diverse dance students. Physical education and dance faculty should be reflective about their behavior as well as their students' teaching style preferences and pedagogical objectives to adjust to the challenges of the curricula design and instruction.

Future researchers must conduct studies in the teaching styles of dance educators to meet the demand of the dance education students as well as in preparation for effective curriculum planning and implementation. Measuring and assessing the educators' teaching performance including needs, patterns, and beliefs must be one of the primary objectives. The evidence produced may be used as springboard for conversations and major

decisions about our future in the academe. Lastly, there should be a wider dissemination of the results of this study to validate the findings and be a basis of further research to vast changing needs, significance, and contribution of dance education in the academe.

REFERENCES

- Aguda, K., Almario, M.S., Babasa, A.D., Banayos, C.M., & Carlo, J.V. (2009). Effects of different teaching styles in students' learning. (Unpublished Thesis, DLSU-HSI).
- Coalition of Essential Schools. (2007). Smaller Learning Communities Program (Grant Application Package). Battle Creek, MI: Author
- Conti, G. J. (2004). The relationship between teaching style and adult student learning. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 220-228.
- Curacho, L. A. (2009). *Instructional competency, commitment of secondary mathematics teachers and student's performance in the Division of Calamba City, school year 2008-2009*. (Unpublished Dissertation, UPHL).
- Department of Education. (2012). K to 12 curriculum guide in physical education. Pasig City: DepEdComplex.
- Diaz Larenas, C. H., Rodriguez Moran, A. V., & Poblete Rivera, K.J. (2011). Comparing teaching styles and personality types of efl instructors in the public and private sectors. *Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Facultad de Ciencias Humanas, Departamento de Lenguas Extranjeras*, 13(1), 111-127.

Davis-Langston, C. (2012). Exploring relationship among teaching styles, teachers' perceptions of their self efficacy and students' mathematics achievement. *Published Dissertation, Liberty University.*

Domingo, J.P. (2012). *Profile and teaching styles of dance educators in the Philippines.* (Unpublished Thesis, Polytechnic University of the Philippines Graduate School). Sta. Mesa, Manila.

Domingo, J.P., Alonte, J. B., Co, P., Alonte, A. B., Cong-O, D. L., Garcia, F. V., Nimor, C. F., Janson, M. C., & Nazuel, H. A. (2010). *Physical education II: Beginner's dance book.* (Rev. ed.). Valenzuela City: Mutya Publishing House, Inc.

Evans, C., Harkins, M. J., & Young, J. D. (2008). Exploring teaching styles and cognitive styles: Evidence from school teachers in Canada. *North American Journal of Psychology, 10(3), 567-582.* USA: North American Journal Of Psychology. Retrieved from <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/North-American-Journal-Psychology/191856988.html>

Florido, A. M. (2006). Educational profile of the Philippines and best practices in Filipino schools and classrooms. Garinger High School and Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/world/2006_K12Symp/Pres&HOs/Florido_Handout1.pdf

Grasha, A. F. (1996). *Teaching with styles: A practical guide to enhance learning by*

understanding learning and teaching Styles.
New York, U.S.A.: Pittsburg Alliance Publisher.

Hoyt, D. P. & Lee, E. (2002). Teaching styles and learning outcomes. *IDEA Research Report*, (4): 1-4. Retrieved from Eric Database. (ED472498),
http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED472498&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED472498

Land, A. (n.d.). Preschool teaching styles. Teaching styles are not the same at every preschool.
Retrieved from
<http://journalist.6574122.preschool-teaching-styles.html>

Macfadyen, T. & Campbell, C. (2005). An investigation into the teaching styles of secondary school physical education teachers. University of Reading. *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Glamorgan*, 14-17 September 2005.

Mainwaring, L. M. & Krasnow, D.H. (2010). Teaching the dance class: Strategies to enhance skill acquisition, mastery and positive self-image. *Conditioning with Imagery for Dancers*, 10(1). Retrieved from
<http://www.citraining.com/Teaching-the-Dance-Class-Strategies.html>

Meyer-Looze, C. L. (2011). An examination of the relationship between the generation a teacher is born into, teaching style, and high school student engagement. *Eastern Michigan*

University: Digital Commons @ EMU, Masters Theses and Doctoral Dissertations. Paper 309.

Razak, N., Ahmad, F., & Shah, P. M. (2007). Perceived and preferred teaching styles of English for specific purposes (ESP) students. *Jurnal e-Bangi, Electronic Journal, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan, Malaysia*, 2(2), 1-20.

SPSS Inc (2008). *SPSS Version 16 for Windows*. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage