

The College of Teacher Education Students' Preferred Teaching Style: For an Instructional Enhancement

Maritess T. Kho¹, Sheilla Marie A. Falar², Judy Ann O. Ferrater-Gimena³, Maleen Grafilo Ordiz⁴,
Lynie P. Mindajao⁵

^{1,2}University of Cebu-Banilad Cebu City, Cebu

^{3,4,5}University of Cebu Cebu City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100900386>

Received: 17 September 2026; Accepted: 22 September 2026; Published: 12 October 2026

ABSTRACT

Designing and presenting lessons is the core of the teaching process. Every day teachers make decisions about the instructional process. A teacher's approach can have an enormous impact on his or her teaching effectiveness. Understanding students' preferences toward teaching approaches and teaching styles can create opportunities for teachers to make adjustments that better serve their students. This study assessed the students' preference for teaching-learning methods, strategies, and approaches to help produce competitive, innovative, creative, and well-rounded education graduates. This research utilized a descriptive-correlational research design using a researcher-designed survey questionnaire. A self-made questionnaire was used to gather data and was subjected to pilot testing to test its reliability. One hundred forty-five education students enrolled in the school year, 2018-2019, willingly participated in the study and were chosen using the purposive sampling technique. Frequency count and the percentage were used to determine the profile and the preferred teaching methods and approaches, while the Chi-square test of independence was used to determine the significant relationship between the respondents' profile and their preferred teaching style or method and approaches. Results revealed that most of the respondents were females under the youngest category, 18 years old and below. Moreover, the respondents had a high preference for direct instruction, demonstration, partner learning, deductive, and inductive approaches. Also, the respondents had an unvarying high preference in all the teaching methods, especially 4A's. It is concluded that students taking Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) and Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) have a clear preference toward the combination of learner-centered and teacher-directed teaching approaches and methodologies.

Keywords: Principles of teaching, preferred teaching approaches, strategies, College of Teachers Education students, correlation, Cebu City, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Educational systems consist of many elements, including students, teachers, curriculum, environment, and many others. However, teachers are the essential element since the quality of the education mostly depends on the quality and competence of the teachers (Unal, 2017). Also, the teachers serve as the prime movers of the educational wheel, while the learners are the key participants in the learning process. The favorable environment provides essential features that could make headway in guiding the teaching-learning processes and methodologies needed for a smooth linkage among the three (Corpuz & Salandanan, 2015).

Teaching is both an art and a science. There should be permanent changes in learners' behavior to establish learning, and teachers are expected to use teaching techniques effectively. Also, they should possess modern management skills in classroom environments. Though all teachers infuse lessons with their unique mix of personality and style, they also rely on time-tested and research-based teaching methods and strategies. Technology has been a massive game-changer for schools and teachers; however, many traditional teaching

methods prevail, evolving in ways that allow teachers to adapt and continue to provide quality instruction (Derrel, 2015).

Hence, effective teaching is a crucial building block of high student achievement. It foregrounds the relationship between instruction and student outcomes, supporting student attainment and achievement. Effective teaching, therefore, must place equal emphasis on teacher, student, environment, curriculum, and other factors.

Despite the importance of good teaching, the outcomes are far from ideal. Students fall short in achieving high scores in tests. Hence, their grades are also low. A 2009 international test of reading and math showed that American 15-year-olds perform more poorly, on average, than 15-year-olds in many other countries. This finding from the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is consistent with previous PISA results and results from another international assessment of 8th-graders. The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS). American student achievement lags woefully behind, and these test results, therefore, suggest an urgent need for school reform.

In the Philippines, Malipot (2019) opined that despite implementing the K to 12 curricula designed to provide a holistic education for all Filipino students, Philippine Business for Education (PBS) said the learning outcomes tell a different story. This is because early childhood comprehension remains poor, with more than a third of Filipino children scoring zero on both reading and listening. PBS noted that achievement scores for elementary and secondary levels have also stalled at 59%, well below the 77% national target – similarly, passing rates at licensure examination disciplines barely reach the target passing rate.

The College of Teacher Education in a university endeavor to produce competent graduates eligible for a teaching position in the elementary or high school in the country. Despite its efforts in providing high-quality professional programs, still, some students are proven inadequate, as revealed in their GPA (grade point average). As pointed out in the informal interview conducted among them, the typical responses they gave for their inadequacies were the teachers' methods and approaches in teaching.

Hence, to bring an effective teaching-learning environment and to attain the objectives set, selection and implementation of various appropriate teaching methods is an indispensable agendum. Thus, the active involvement of students in the decision-making process and recognition of their preferences on the teaching methods and approaches are vital to creating a conducive educational environment, thereby bringing effective teaching-learning process. Students' academic achievement is also influenced by their attitude and desire to handle the teaching methods. The disparity between students' preferences and the method of teaching applied has a significant influence on students' success. Therefore, the main essence of this study is to assess students' preference in teaching-learning methods and strategies to help produce innovative, creative, competitive, and well-rounded education graduates.

FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored on David Kolb's Learning Style Theory which shows four distinct learning styles. This theory explains that every individual naturally prefers a particular learning style in which he/she can acquire meaningful learning. It emphasizes that an individual's preferred learning delivery model is critical in acquiring learning. He believed that learners' learning preferences come from their educational experiences and the demands of their current environment. The four learning styles of Kolb consist of diverging, assimilating, converging, and accommodating. In a divergent style, a person works in groups and receives personal feedback. The second learning style is assimilative, in which a person is less on people and more on ideas. They prefer readings lectures and have time to think things through. Next is the convergent learning style, where the learners like to experiment with new ideas. Finally, the accommodative learning style emphasizes that an individual adapts to a new situation and prefers finishing tasks following instructions (Richmond & Cummings, 2005).

The Social Learning Theory by Albert Bandura emphasizes that learning is by observing others. This theory

considers how the environment influences human learning and behavior. Bandura agrees with the behavioral learning theories, which claim that behavior is learned from the environment through observation. Moreover, social learning theory implies that people learn from social interactions with others in a social context (Corpuz et al., 2018).

Further, the Constructivist Learning Theory of Jean Piaget supports the anchored theory above. This explains that learning is a search for meaning. This theory supports a learner-centered classroom. Piaget argues that individuals produce their knowledge through active participation in their learning (Rungduin et al., 2021). Constructivist suggests that the teacher should also become a facilitator and a co-explorer. Weegar and Pacis (2012) claimed that this theory could be applied in both online and face-to-face learning modalities through students' active involvement, inquiry, problem-solving, and collaboration in learning.

Teacher education aims to produce competent graduates eligible to teach in any educational institution. Universities endeavor to provide high-quality professional programs to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional attributes students will require to practice their teaching profession. Students are an essential stakeholder in monitoring and evaluating the quality of programs, courses, and teaching and learning. Student perspectives can also be an integral part of quality enhancement procedures to improve teaching and learning activities (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Understanding students' preferences toward teaching approaches and teaching styles can create opportunities for teachers to make adjustments that better serve their students (Mermelstein, 2015).

The Queensland government mentioned that direct teaching instruction is a step-by-step, lesson-by-lesson approach to teaching which is scripted and follows a pre-determined skill acquisition sequence. Using direct teaching or instruction aims to take local variation and teacher-child idiosyncrasy out of instruction and for children to learn through imitation. It is also used as a general term for teaching skills by telling or demonstrating. In general, direct instruction is an active, reflective approach that breaks learning into smaller steps with scaffolding, leading to students' independence and mastery (Rupley, 2009).

Baker et al. (2013) describe the compelling evidence indicating that explicit [direct] instruction positively impacts a range of student academic outcomes, particularly for students who are at risk for academic difficulties.

According to Ogwen et al. (2013), the demonstration teaching method is a traditional classroom strategy used in technical and training colleges, even in teacher education. It develops in various ways to make learning permanent. Though teacher behavior is autocratic, he or she invites pupils' cooperation in the teaching-learning process. It develops an interest in the learners and motivates them for their active participation. This teaching strategy follows the learning maxim, considers skills development by limitation, and utilizes perception to ignite imitation.

Peer teaching is a design when students teach other students. It enables learners to take responsibility for reviewing, organizing and consolidating existing knowledge and material, understanding its basic structure, filling in the gaps, finding additional meanings, and reformulating knowledge into new conceptual frameworks to enhance learning. It is structured that help from peers increases learning both for the students being helped and those giving the help. For the students being helped, the assistance from their peers enables them to move away from dependence on teachers and gain more opportunities to enhance their learning. For the students giving the help, the cooperative learning groups serve as opportunities to increase their performance. They have the chance to experience and learn that teaching is the best teacher (TeachThought, 2017).

Florin (2019) explained that the inductive method allows learners to discover and experience phenomena to achieve learning on their own. This method is considered a learner-centered approach and is also known as the indirect teaching method. The teacher does not directly supply the information students have to learn. Instead, the teacher provides students with more avenues to think and understand what they have observed and experienced. It, therefore, allows learners to discover and experience phenomena to achieve learning on their own. Students retain information longer when learning is through self-discovery and experience. The

learning process becomes meaningful for them, as they can actively participate. The learners developed independent thinking learned to analyze and process the information. Higher-order thinking skills are utilized, and authentic learning is achieved.

Almutairi (2015) mentioned that brainstorming provides a free and open environment that encourages everyone to participate. It combines a relaxed, informal approach to problem-solving with lateral thinking. It encourages people to come up with thoughts and ideas that can, at first, seem a bit crazy. Ideas are welcomed and built upon, and all participants are encouraged to contribute fully, helping them develop a rich array of creative solutions. This helps to get learners unstuck by "jolting" them out of their typical ways of thinking. In brainstorming sessions, learners should avoid criticizing or rewarding ideas to lessen the possibilities of breaking down incorrect assumptions about the problem's limits—judgment and analysis at this stage stunts idea generation and limit creativity. This involves evaluating ideas at the end of the session. This is the time to explore solutions further, using conventional approaches.

Simulation is a teaching strategy that aims to provide an experience as close to the 'real thing' as possible. It is contextualized in imitating real-world activities and processes in a safe environment. Learners can reset the scenario and try alternative strategies and approaches through a simulated activity. It allows the learners to experience specific situations by applying their more comprehensive learning and knowledge. The approach is frequently used in disciplines where students need to develop skills and experience, but safety issues or cost considerations prevent this from happening in the real-world (Glover, 2014).

Objectives of the Study

The main essence of this study is to assess students' preference in teaching-learning methods, strategies, and approaches to help produce innovative, creative, competitive, and well-rounded education graduates. The results will be the basis for an instructional enhancement program.

METHODOLOGY

This sections presents the research design, research environment, research respondents, research instruments, and research procedures.

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design to determine the students' preferences in teaching and learning methodologies, approaches, and strategies.

Correlational research is a type of non-experimental research in which the researcher measures two variables and assesses the statistical relationship (i.e., the correlation) between them with little or no effort to control extraneous variables. There are many reasons that researchers interested in statistical relationships between variables would choose to conduct a correlational study rather than an experiment. The first is that they do not believe that the statistical relationship is causal or are not interested in causal relationships. Recall two goals of science are to describe and predict, and the correlational research strategy allows researchers to achieve both goals. Specifically, this strategy can describe the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables. If there is a relationship between the variables, the researchers can use scores on one variable to predict scores on the other (using a statistical technique called regression) (Price et al., n.d.).

Research Environment

This study was conducted at the College of Teacher Education (CTE) of the University of Cebu- Banilad Campus, which offers both the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) and Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) program. The University of Cebu (UC) is one of the higher education institutions (HEIs) in the country that provides a broad range and differentiated instruction that caters to varied interests and abilities of 21st- century learning.

Research Respondents

At the time of the study, the total population of the College of Teacher Education (CTE) of the University of Cebu-Banilad Campus (UC-B) was four hundred thirty (430) based on the enrolment record. Moreover, using the purposive sampling technique, the research participants of this study were the one hundred forty-five (145) first-year education students who were officially enrolled in the school year, 2018-2019.

Research Instrument

The researchers utilized a researcher-designed questionnaire to gather information about their teaching style preferences. The contains of the self-made questionnaire was one hundred fifty (150) items with three (3) parts. The first portion of the tool pertains to the teaching methods preferences (50) items. The second portion pertains to teaching approaches preferences comprising fifty (50) items, and the third section relates to teaching strategies, which consists of fifty (50) items.

A dry run procedure was conducted to test the reliability of the researcher-made survey questionnaire among the higher year level students of the Cebu College of Teacher education from the University of Cebu. The participants were asked to answer the survey questionnaire to assess their teaching preferences. The Kuder-Richardson computed value of 0.992 indicates that the survey questionnaire was excellent and showed a high degree of consistency. It further signifies the accuracy, stability, and precision of the contents therein.

Research Procedures

Before conducting the study, permission from the university's authorities was sought. This investigation ensures that the research participants will benefit from the study outcome. Further, the conduct of the investigation ensures that the research participants' participation is out of their free will, as evidenced by the consent form where they affix their signature. There was also no discrimination on the choice of study participation as to socio-economic status, religion, and others. Confidentiality of the data was also observed wherein there was no identification between the participants and the test results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Why do teachers continue to do what they do? Teachers bask in their students' success, and students' success reflects their teachers' effectiveness. It is great to be with the winners. The very best teachers contemplate how they will present a topic and have a wide variety of instructional models at their disposal. Professional-level teaching is both an art and a science. A good teacher makes decisions from technical and creative perspectives like an artist. Great artist displays a mastery of technical skills-painting, glass blowing, sculpting-that involves the science behind these techniques. They also know when and in what way to apply those technical skills. They make decisions. That part is an art. Similarly, teachers develop their science by using carefully planned, fine-tuned lessons that reflect an understanding of many different teaching techniques. They apply each technique skillfully to gain the desired intellectual, social, affective, or kinesthetic result. They develop artistry by being aware of what they are doing and how they affect their learners. They are constantly are that the choices they make affect their learners. They are constantly aware that their choices affect their students' intellectual, attitudinal, and psychomotor skills. Above all, they made decisions (Orlich et al., 2016).

This section presents the data relating to the College of Teacher Education (CTE) students' preference for teaching approaches and strategies.

Table 1. Age and Level of Preferences on Teaching Approaches and Strategies

Indicators	Age of the Respondents				
	18 years old	19 years old	20 years old	20 years and old	Total

		and below				above			
Teaching Approaches	Level	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
and Strategies	HP	39	26.9	15	10.3	9	6.2	63	43.4
A. Direct Instruction or Lecture Method	AP	40	27.6	16	11	12	8.3	68	46.9
	LP	8	5.5	4	2.8	1	0.7	13	9
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100
B. Demonstration Method	HP	51	35.2	20	13.8	12	8.3	83	57.2
	AP	32	22.1	13	9	8	5.5	53	36.6
	LP	5	3.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	8	5.5
	NP	0	0	0	0	1	0.7	1	0.7
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.2	22	15.2	145	100
C. Peer Tutoring/ Peer Teaching	HP	33	22.8	17	11.7	12	8.3	62	42.8
	AP	40	27.6	15	10.3	7	4.8	62	42.8
	LP	12	8.3	2	1.4	3	2.2	17	11.7
	NP	3	2.1	1	0.7	0	0	4	2.8
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100
D. Partner Learning	HP	54	37.2	24	16.6	10	6.9	88	60.7
	AP	29	20	11	7.6	11	7.6	51	35.2
	LP	4	2.8	0	0	1	0.7	5	3.4
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100
E. Deductive Method	HP	51	35.2	23	15.9	15	10.3	89	61.4
	AP	30	20.7	10	6.9	6	4.1	46	31.7
	LP	6	4.1	2	1.4	1	0.7	9	6.2
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100
F. Inductive Method	HP	65	44.8	22	15.2	15	10.3	102	70.3
	AP	22	15.2	12	8.3	6	4.1	40	27.6

	LP	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	3	2.1
	NP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100
Overall	HP	70	48.3	26	17.9	14	9.7	110	75.9
	AP	18	12.4	9	6.2	8	5.5	35	24.1
	Total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100

Legend: HP= Highly Preferred; AP=Adequately Preferred; LP=Less Preferred; NP=Not Preferred

Table 1 uncovers the respondents' preference level in varied teaching approaches and strategies when categorized according to their age profile. There were eighty-eight (88) or 60.7% with age 18 years old and below. They constituted 53 or 36.6 % more than those whose age was 19 years old and 66 or 45.5 % more than those whose age was 20 years and above.

It can be gleaned in the data that freshmen students of the College of Teacher Education preferred different teaching strategies from their instructors depending on the subject matter or lesson being studied in the various subjects they enrolled. In this way, they will not get bored with the way lessons are presented to them.

Forty (40) or 27.6% of respondents under the youngest category indicated an adequate preference for direct instruction or lecture teaching. This proportion of the respondents was more than those who indicated a high preference towards this kind of teaching approach. The same patterns were observed with those who were 19 years old during the conduct of the study, wherein sixteen (16) or 11 % stipulated adequate preference and fifteen (15) or 10.3% preferred highly towards this approach. The most significant portion of the respondents aged 20 and above communicated that twelve (12) or 8.3% adequately preferred while nine (9) or 6.2% had a high preference. Therefore, the respondents indicated adequate preference over direct instruction or lecture teaching approaches in each age bracket category. This result indicates that more young students preferred that their teachers present the subject matter to them. This way, they would grasp the lesson quickly, considering they are still adjusting for their college studies. Of the one hundred forty-five freshmen education students of the academic year 2018-2019, eighty-three (83) or 57.2% disclosed a high preference towards a demonstration approach to learning. There were thirty (30) or 20.6% more than those who adequately-preferred on the latter approach, fifty-one (51) or 35.2% were from the youngest respondents, twenty (20) or 13.8 % were 19 years of age, and twelve (12) or 8.3% were respondents under the oldest category. Fifty-three (53) or 36.6% disclosed adequate preference towards the demonstration approach. Thirty-two (32) or 22.1% were from the youngest category, thirteen (13) or 9% were from the middle category, and eight (8) or 5.5% were from the oldest category. The findings revealed that most of the respondents in all three age categories stipulated a high preference towards a demonstration approach in teaching since they will better understand the subject matter if the teacher has a demonstration in front of them.

On the other hand, the respondents' revealed a bimodal level of preferences in peer teaching strategies when the responses were categorized according to their age profile. The findings revealed that both high and adequate categories encrypted the proportion of 42.8%. This data means that as many freshmen students adequately and highly preferred peer teaching approaches since there would be deeper learning with classmates. This is also a means of developing independent learning with class partners.

However, variations on the distributions of responses across the three age categories vis-a-vis their level of preferences were visible. For those who had a high preference for this teaching approach, thirty-three (33) or 22.8% were 18 years old, and below, seventeen (17) or 11.7% were 19 years old, and twelve (12) or 8.3% were 20 years and above. For respondents with an adequate preference on this teaching approach, forty (40)

or 27.6% were 18 years and below, fifteen (15) or 10.3% were from 19 years old, and seven (7) or 4.8% were 20 years and older. The findings further signify that most of the respondents-18 years old and below had an adequate preference for learning with classmates while 19 years old and above had a high preference for this teaching-learning style.

The most considerable portion in the first two age categories (20 years and older) had a high and adequate preference for partner learning approaches. For respondents who expressed a high preference for this teaching approach, fifty-four (54) or 37.2% were 18 years and below, twenty-four (24) or 16.6% were 19 years old, and ten (10) or 6.9% were 20 years and older. A total of eighty-eight (88) or 60.7% of the respondents stipulated a high preference towards this approach. Fifty-one (51) or 35.2% of the respondents had an adequate preference, twenty-nine (29) or 20% (18 years and younger) and eleven (11) or 7.6% from each of the last two categories on learning with partners. The results also revealed that respondents with a high preference towards this approach were twenty-five (25) or 17.2% more than those who responded with good preference. Overall, the respondents had a high preference for the partner learning approach.

For 18 years old and younger respondents, fifty-one (51) or 35.2% had a high preference towards the deductive teaching method. The latter proportion was twenty-one (21) or 14.5% more than those who adequately preferred. Twenty-three (23) or 15.9 % 19-year old respondents imparted high preference for this approach. The latter proportion was thirteen (13) or 9% more than those who revealed adequate preference on deductive approaches. There were fifteen (15) or 10.3 % respondents aged 20 years and older. The latter proportion was nine (9) or 6.2% more than those who adequately preferred this approach. Overall, the respondents highly preferred the traditional approach in which information about target language and rules are driven at the beginning of the class and continued with examples.

In each age category, the respondents had a high preference for inductive approaches in teaching. Sixty-five (65) or 44.8% were from the youngest respondents, twenty-two (22) or 15.2 from the 19-year-old category, and fifteen (15) or 10.3% were from the oldest respondents. A total of one hundred two (102) or 70.3% of the respondents had a high preference for this approach. The results also imparted that a total of forty (40) or 27.6% had a good preference for this approach. These responses were sixty-two (62) or 47.6% lesser than those with a high preference for inductive teaching approaches. Hence, the majority of the respondents had a high preference for the teaching approach when the teacher presents the rule through situations and sentences and does guided practice, and then the learners do the free practice and sentences and do guide practice, and then the learners do the free practice.

The very best teachers contemplate the manner in which they will present a topic and, through their teacher education programs, have a wide variety of instructional models at their disposal (Orlich et al., 2016). McGonigal (2005) opined that no matter what the teacher teaches, he or she faces the challenge of bridging students from point A-what they currently know-to point B-the learning goals of a course. In many courses the distance between point a and b is huge, the path is not obvious. Students must not only acquire new skills and information, but also radically transform their approach to thinking and learning. So even though students may have no experience in the class or the field, they enter the classroom with a long history if academic training and life experience. For this reason present new information is not enough to guarantee optimal learning.

Table 1.2 presents the data relating to the respondents' age and their preferred teaching methods and strategies

Table 1.2. Respondents' Age and Preferred Teaching Methods and Strategies

Types of Teaching Methods/Strategies	Age of the Respondents			
	18 and below	19 years old	20 and above	Total

	Level	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
1. Brainstorming	HP	39	26.9	15	10.3	9	6.2	63	43.4
	AP	40	27.6	16	11	12	8.3	68	46.9
	LP	8	5.5	4	2.8	1	0.7	13	9
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.7
2. Simulation	HP	47	32.4	20	13.8	8	5.5	75	51.7
	AP	38	26.2	9	6.2	12	8.3	59	40.7
	LP	2	1.4	3	2.1	2	1.4	7	4.8
	NP	1	0.7	3	2.1	0	0	4	2.8
3. Demonstration	HP	48	33.1	25	17.2	16	11	89	61.4
	AP	30	20.7	9	6.2	5	3.4	44	30.3
	LP	6	4.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	8	5.5
	NP	4	2.8	0	0	0	0	4	2.8
4. Lectures/Presentation	HP	41	28.3	14	9.7	12	8.3	67	46.2
	AP	41	28.3	16	11	8	5.5	65	44.8
	LP	6	4.1	3	2.1	2	1.4	11	7.6
	NP	0	0	2	1.4	0	0	2	1.4
5. Questioning	HP	63	43.4	13	9	11	7.6	87	60
	AP	21	14.5	19	13.1	8	5.5	48	33.1
	LP	3	2.1	2	1.4	3	2.1	8	5.5
	NP	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0	2	1.4
6. Self Study	HP	57	39.3	22	15.2	12	8.3	91	62.8
	AP	27	18.6	10	6.9	7	4.8	44	30.3
	LP	3	2.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	7	4.8
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	2	1.4	3	2.1
7. Case Studies	HP	53	36.6	21	14.5	10	6.9	84	57.9

	AP	31	21.4	11	7.6	9	6.2	51	35.2
	LP	3	2.1	3	2.1	2	1.4	8	5.5
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	1	0.7	2	1.4
8. Collaborative Learning	HP	63	43.4	13	9	11	7.6	87	60
	AP	21	14.5	19	13.1	8	5.5	48	33.1
	LP	3	2.1	2	1.4	3	2.1	8	5.5
	NP	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0	2	1.4
9. 4A's	HP	64	44.1	23	15.9	18	12.4	105	72.4
	AP	20	13.8	10	6.9	3	2.1	33	22.8
	LP	3	2.1	0	0	1	0.7	4	2.8
	NP	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0	3	2.1
10. Cooperative Learning	HP	57	39.3	18	12.4	11	7.6	86	59.3
	AP	28	19.3	14	9.7	8	5.5	50	34.5
	LP	2	1.4	3	2.1	3	2.1	8	5.5
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.7
	total	88	60.7	35	24.1	22	15.2	145	100

The respondents had an adequate preference for the brainstorming teaching method in each age category. Specifically, forty (40) or 27.6% from the youngest respondents, sixteen (16) or 11% from the 19-year-old category, and twelve (12) or 8.3% were from the oldest group of respondents. In addition, sixty-eight (68) or 46.9% of the respondents had an adequate preference, while sixty-three (63) or 43.4% had a high preference towards brainstorming. The latter figures were five (5) or 3.5% lesser than those who had an adequate preference towards brainstorming methods in teaching. This means that more of the respondents would like their teachers to apply their critical thinking skills to resolve issues.

The respondents aged 19 years old and younger indicated a high preference, while those under the oldest category had an adequate preference towards the simulation teaching method. Seventy-five (75) out of one hundred forty-five (145) respondents specified a high preference towards simulation methods in teaching, wherein forty-seven (47) or 32.4% were from the youngest age category and twenty (20) or 13.8% aged 19 years old. Nine (9) or 6.2% more respondents from the youngest category preferred this method more than those who adequately preferred it. For respondents 19 years of age, there were eleven (11) or 7.6% more who had high preference than those who stipulated adequate preference. Overall, the respondents had a high preference for simulation methods in teaching, wherein the instructional scenarios involved placing the learner in a world defined by the teacher.

In each of the three age categories, the respondents had a high preference for demonstration methods of teaching, comprising of eighty-nine (89) or 61.4% respondents, forty-eight (48) or 33.1% were from the youngest respondents, twenty-five (25) or 17.2 % from the 19-year-old category, and sixteen (16) or 11% were from the oldest respondents. Meanwhile, forty-four (44) or 30.3% of the respondents communicated an adequate preference towards this teaching method. Thirty (30) or 20.7% were from the youngest respondents, nine (9) or 6.2 were from 19-year-old respondents, and five (5) or 3.4% were from the oldest

category. Most education students would like their teacher to communicate an idea with visuals such as flip charts, posters, PowerPoint, and others.

The respondents had a relatively high preference towards the lecture or presentation teaching method. Bimodal responses were noted for those 18 years old and younger. An equal proportion of those who had a high and adequate preference, while those aged 19 years old adequately preferred this abovementioned teaching method. Two (2) or 1.3% more respondents who adequately preferred than those who responded highly preferred and four (4) or 2.8% more respondents who revealed high preference than those who had an adequate preference.

The respondents under extreme age categories, such as 18 years old and younger, and those 20 years and older highly preferred the questioning teaching methods. Mainly, eighty-seven (87) or 60% highly preferred probing type of teaching wherein sixty-three (63) or 43.4% were from the youngest category, thirteen (13) or 9% aged 19 years old, and eleven (11) or 7.6% were from the oldest category. Forty-eight (48) or 33.1% indicated adequate preference. Overall, thirty-nine (39) or 26.9% more respondents had a high preference towards the questioning method than those who adequately preferred when the teacher would prompt them to think about what is being taught.

Ninety-one (91) or 62.8% declared high preference, and forty-four (44) or 30.3% mentioned adequate preference towards self-study. Forty-seven (47) more highly preferred respondents than those who adequately preferred the self-study teaching method. There were thirty (30) or 20.7% more 18 years old and younger, twelve (12) or 8.3 % more 19 years old respondents, and five (5) or 3.5% 20 years and older who were of high preference than those who were of adequate preference towards such teaching method. In each of the three age categories, the respondents divulged high preference towards learning methods where students direct their studying.

In each of the three age categories, respondents had a high preference towards the case study teaching method, consisting of 18 years old and below, fifty-three (53) or 36.6%, while thirty-one (31) or 21.4% desired this method adequately. There were twenty-two (22) more respondents who preferred highly than those who had an adequate preference towards the case study method. For respondents who were 19 years of age, twenty-one (21) or 14.5% had a high preference, and eleven (11) or 7.6% had an adequate preference. Ten (10) more respondents had high preference than those who had an adequate preference. For respondents with the age of 20 years and older, ten (10) or 6.9% had a high preference, and nine (9) or 6.2% had an adequate preference to a teaching strategy where the teacher would analyze a defined problem consisting in an actual situation and uses accurate information as a methodological tool.

Overall, the respondents had a high preference towards the collaborative learning method, consisting of eighty-seven (87) or 60% of the respondents.

For the youngest category, forty-two (42) or 28.9% more respondents specified high preference than those who indicated adequate preference. The majority of the 19-year-old respondents adequately preferred collaborative learning. Eleven (11) or 7.6% of the respondents aged 20 years and older highly preferred team teaching or involving educators working together to lead, instruct and mentor groups of students. The respondents highly preferred the 4A's teaching method, wherein one hundred five (105) or 72.4% signified high preference and thirty-three (33) or 22.8% had an adequate preference. There were seventy-two (72) or 49.6% more respondents who had a high preference than those who adequately preferred the method towards the 4A's. Regarding respondents aged 18 years old and younger, forty-four (44) or 30.3% more highly preferred encrypted responses than adequately-preferred ones. There were thirteen (13) or 9% more 19-year-old respondents who preferred highly than those who preferred it to an adequate extent. The majority of the respondents in each of the three age categories highly preferred the 4A's teaching method of activities, analysis, abstraction, and application.

In each of the three age categories, most of the respondents had a high preference towards cooperative learning strategies comprised of respondents belonging to the youngest category. In contrast, fifty-seven

(57) or 39.3% (stipulated high preference), twenty-eight (28), or 19.3% (stated adequate preference), twenty-nine (29) or 20% preferred "highly" than those who preferred "adequately." For 19-year-old respondents, a difference of four (4) or 2.7% more highly preferred encrypted responses were noted. For 20 years and older respondents, a difference of three (3) or 2.1% more highly preferred responses were visible wherein the education students would like that they were given a chance to work in small groups to accomplish a common learning goal under the guidance of the teacher.

Table 1.3 shows the data about the respondents' gender and their preferred teaching

Table 1.3. Respondents' Gender and Preferred Teaching Approaches and Strategies

Preferred Teaching Approaches	Level	Female		Male		Total	
		F	%	f	%	f	%
A. Direct Instruction	HP	53	36.6	10	6.9	63	43.4
	AP	62	42.8	6	4.1	68	46.9
	LP	13	9	0	0	13	9
	NT	1	0.7	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100
B. Demonstration	HP	73	50.3	10	6.9	83	57.2
	AP	48	33.1	5	3.4	53	36.6
	LP	8	5.5	0	0	8	5.5
	NT	0	0	1	0.7	1	0.7
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100
C. Peer Tutoring	HP	53	36.6	9	6.2	62	42.8
	AP	59	40.7	3	2.1	62	42.8
	LP	14	9.7	3	2.1	17	11.7
	NT	3	2.1	1	0.7	4	2.8
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100
D. Partner Learning	HP	78	53.8	10	6.9	88	60.7
	AP	45	31	6	4.1	51	35.2
	LP	5	3.4	0	0	5	3.4
	NT	1	0.7	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100

E. Deductive Method	HP	78	53.8	11	7.6	89	61.4
	AP	41	28.3	5	3.4	46	31.7
	LP	9	6.2	0	0	9	6.2
	NT	1	0.7	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100
F. Inductive Method	HP	93	64.1	9	6.2	102	70.3
	AP	33	22.8	7	4.8	40	27.6
	LP	3	2.1	0	0	3	2.1
	NT	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100

Legend: HP= Highly Preferred; AP=Adequately Preferred; LP=Less Preferred; NP=Not Preferred

Of the one hundred forty-five (145) respondents, one hundred twenty-nine (129) or 89% were females, and sixteen (16) or 11% were males. The majority of the female respondents stipulated high preference towards demonstration, partner learning, deductive, and inductive teaching methods, and adequate preference towards direct instruction and peer tutoring. On the other hand, the majority of the male respondents indicated a high preference in each of the six methods under investigation.

The majority of the female respondents adequately preferred the direct instruction method, wherein eleven (11) or 6.2% more female respondents had adequate preference than those with a high preference for this teaching approach. On the other side, the majority of the male respondents adequately preferred direct instruction. The majority of the male respondents were 2.8% more than those in the adequate level category. Overall, sixty-eight (68) or 46.9% of the respondents adequately preferred explicit teaching techniques.

The majority of both female (seventy-three (73) or 50.3 %) and male (ten (10) or 6.9%) respondents highly preferred the demonstration approach to learning. Fifty-three (53) or 36.6% responded with an adequate preference on teaching involving showing by reason or proof, explaining or making clear by using examples or experiments.

Overall, the majority of the female respondents adequately preferred peer teaching approaches. In specifics, fifty-nine (59) or 40.7% had an adequate preference, while fifty-three (53) or 36.6% indicated a high preference towards peer tutoring teaching approach. Six (6) or equivalently 4.1% more female respondents adequately preferred the peer tutoring teaching approach than those who highly preferred it. On the other hand, nine (9) or 6.2% male respondents strongly preferred the approach, while only three (3) or 2.1% stipulated adequate preference. This data meant that the majority of the male respondents adequately preferred a teaching approach involving students serving as academic tutors and tutees. Typically, a higher-performing student is paired with a lower-performing student to review critical academic or behavioral concepts. The data revealed a unanimous modal category in each of the two groups of respondents. For female respondents, seventy-eight (78) or 53.8% highly preferred partner learning approach, and forty-five (45) or 31% responded adequately preferred. The difference of thirty-three (33) or 22.8% was noted. In this teaching approach, they would like two students to purposefully assist each other in acquiring the skills, knowledge, and attributes necessary to attain their learning goals.

The majority of the two groups of respondents highly preferred the deductive teaching method, consisting of seventy-eight (78) or equivalently 53.8% female respondents highly preferred and forty-one (41) or 28.3% adequately preferred a teaching approach by giving learners rules, then examples, then practice. This communicated that there were (37) or 25.5% more female respondents who had a high preference for the deductive method than those who had an adequate preference. As to the male respondents, eleven (11) or 7.6% had a high preference for it. The results revealed clearly, a difference of six (6) or 4.2% more highly preferred responses than those adequately-preferred ones.

The majority of the female respondents indicated a high preference towards the inductive teaching method, with ninety-three (93) or 64.1%. Thirty-three (33) or 22.8% responded with adequate preference to a teaching wherein the teacher presents the rule through situations and sentences and does guide practice, and then the learners do the free practice. The latter proportion was nearly tripled to those who responded with high preference. As to the male respondents, nine (9) or 6.2% responded with a high preference towards this approach, and seven (7) or 4.8% stipulated adequate preference. The results signified that the inductive method in teaching was highly preferred in each of the two groups of respondents. Students must recognize the limitations of their current knowledge and perspectives. This result means that the teacher cannot simply unload their knowledge on students. What is required is a true transformation of students' existing knowledge. Hence, instructors from all fields face this challenge (McGonigal, 2005).

Table 1.4 shows the data pertaining to the College of Teacher Education students' gender and their preferred teaching methods and strategies.

Table 1.4 Respondents' Gender and Teaching Methods and Strategies

Types of Teaching Methods/Strategies	Level	Female		Male		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
1. Brainstorming	HP	53	36.6	10	6.9	63	43.4
	AP	62	42.8	6	4.1	68	46.9
	LP	13	9	0	0	13	9
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	1	0.7
2. Simulation	HP	70	48.3	5	3.4	75	51.7
	AP	48	33.1	11	7.6	59	40.7
	LP	7	4.8	0	0	7	4.8
	NP	4	2.8	0	0	4	2.8
3. Demonstration	HP	80	55.2	9	6.2	89	61.4
	AP	40	27.6	4	2.8	44	30.3
	LP	6	4.1	2	1.4	8	5.5
	NP	3	2.1	1	0.7	4	2.8
	HP	59	40.7	8	5.5	67	46.2

4. Lectures/Presentation	AP	58	40	7	4.8	65	44.8
	LP	10	6.9	1	0.7	11	7.6
	NP	2	1.4	0	0	2	1.4
5. Questioning	HP	77	53.1	10	6.9	87	60
	AP	43	29.7	5	3.4	48	33.1
	LP	7	4.8	1	0.7	8	5.5
	NP	2	1.4	0	0	2	1.4
6. Self-Study	HP	82	56.6	9	6.2	91	62.8
	AP	37	25.5	7	4.8	44	30.3
	LP	7	4.8	0	0	7	4.8
	NP	3	2.1	0	0	3	2.1
7. Case Studies	HP	76	52.4	8	5.5	84	57.9
	AP	43	29.7	8	5.5	51	35.2
	LP	8	5.5	0	0	8	5.5
	NP	2	1.4	0	0	2	1.4
8. Collaborative Learning	HP	77	53.1	10	6.9	87	60
	AP	43	29.7	5	3.4	48	33.1
	LP	7	4.8	1	0.7	8	5.5
	NP	2	1.4	0	0	2	1.4
9. 4A's	HP	91	62.8	14	9.7	105	72.4
	AP	31	21.4	2	1.4	33	22.8
	LP	4	2.8	0	0	4	2.8
	NP	3	2.1	0	0	3	2.1
10. Cooperative Learning Strategies	HP	80	55.2	6	4.1	86	59.3
	AP	42	29	8	5.5	50	34.5
	LP	6	4.1	2	1.4	8	5.5
	NP	1	0.7	0	0	1	0.7
	Total	129	89	16	11	145	100

Legend: HP= Highly Preferred; AP=Adequately Preferred; LP=Less Preferred; NP=Not Preferred

The majority of the female respondents expressed a high preference towards simulation, demonstration, lecture, questioning, self-study, case studies, collaborative learning, 4A's, cooperative learning, and adequate preference towards brainstorming teaching method. On the other hand, the majority of the male respondents divulged high preference in brainstorming, demonstration, lecture, questioning, self-study, case studies, 4A's, and cooperative learning strategies. Bimodal preferences such as adequate and high were observed of the male responses on collaborative learning strategies.

The female respondents indicated an adequate preference for brainstorming strategies with sixty-two (62) counts or 42.8%. This proportion is nine (9) or 6.2% more than those who responded with a high preference for brainstorming teaching approach. Brainstorming encourages students to focus on a topic and contribute to the free flow of ideas. On the contrary, the majority of the male respondents stipulated high preference with ten (10) or 6.9%. These figures were four (4) or 2.8% more than those who specified adequate preference towards brainstorming teaching strategy.

The female respondents' modal response towards simulation strategy was high preference with a frequency of (70) or 48.3%, while the forty-eight (48) or 33.1% indicated an adequate preference towards a teaching technique wherein each student can develop individual ability about problem-solving behavior. However, eleven (11) or 7.6% disclosed adequate preference towards the method for male respondents. The findings implied that the modal responses in each group vary; high preference for females and adequate preference for males. The responses communicated unimodal results for both female and male categories. For the female group, eighty (80) or 55.2% had a high preference, while only half had an adequate preference towards demonstration approaches to learning. A relatively the same reasoning was shown for male respondents where nine (9) or 6.2% had a high preference, and four (4) or 2.8% had an adequate preference towards demonstration teaching approach. Overall, demonstration approaches were highly preferred by both male and female respondents. Demonstrations can appeal to different learning styles and aid in a complete understanding for individuals. However, certain considerations must be made for a demonstration to be effective. A demonstration must be fully explained so that all audience members have an equal opportunity to understand.

In both groups of respondents, the results were consistent with the responses of one group of respondents more in the groups who highly preferred than those who adequately preferred the abovementioned teaching approaches and strategies. This signified that the respondents preferred the lecture or presentation strategies regardless of gender. The majority of female and male respondents highly preferred the questioning approach to learning, consisting of seventy-seven (77) or 53.1 % females and ten (10) or 6.9% males. The second-largest proportion in both groups of respondents cast an adequate preference for interrogative teaching, wherein forty-three (43) or 29.7% were females and five (5) or 3.4% were males.

Moreover, the majority of both female (eighty-two (82) or 56.6 %) and male (nine (9) or 6.2%) respondents highly preferred the self-study approach to learning. The second-largest proportions in both groups expressed an adequate preference to independent learning, consisting of thirty-seven (37) or 25.5% females and seven (7) or 4.8% males. For the female category, seventy-six (76) or 52.4% affirmed a high preference towards case studies, and forty-three (43) or 29.7% had an adequate preference for the teaching approach. On the other hand, the responses of the male group equally converged in two categories-high and adequate. The findings connoted that majority of the female respondents had a high preference while male respondents had an equivocally high and adequate preference towards teaching style wherein the students will be made to face a particular problem and explore the real-world issue.

Half of the female respondents had an adequate preference towards the other half had a high preference towards collaborative teaching approaches. Almost the same pattern was observed for male respondents, wherein ten (10) or 6.9% had a high preference and five (5) or 3.4% had an adequate preference towards a learning set-up wherein educators work in tandem to lead, instruct and mentor groups of students. The findings exhibited that the majority in each of the two groups affirmed a high preference towards the team-teaching arrangement.

Ninety-one (91) or 62.8% of the female respondents had a high preference level, and thirty-one (31) or 21.4% had the adequate choice to teaching strategy with more than one instructor who will teach the various topic in one course. All the male respondents had both high and adequate cooperative teaching choices. Fourteen (14) or 9.7% answered high preference, and the remaining two (2) or 1.4% replied with an adequate preference towards learning from different instructors.

Of the one hundred twenty-nine female respondents, eighty (80) or 55.2% recognized high preference, and forty-two (42) or 29% expressed adequate preference towards the cooperative learning strategies. On the contrary, two (2) or 1.4% more male respondents answered adequate extent than those who vouched for high level. The results revealed that the majority of the female and male respondents highly and adequately preferred a teaching strategy, respectively. With this, the students work in small groups to accomplish a common learning goal with the teacher's guidance.

This part shows the data relating to the respondents' preference towards preferred teaching approaches. Direct instruction uses straightforward, explicit teaching techniques, usually to teach a specific skill. It is a teacher-directed method, meaning the teacher stands in front of a classroom and presents the information (Howard, 2018).

A lecture is a time-tested instructional method where an instructor who possesses the knowledge on a given topic delivers all relevant information to students verbally. Lectures are categorized as teacher-centered. Lectures are a straightforward way to provide information knowledge to students quickly. This model dates back to Medieval age, representing an oral tradition in contrast to providing information in print or other media. The word lecture came into use during the 14th century as a verb, "to read or deliver formal discourses. In a lecture, instructors have greater control over what is being taught in the classroom because they are the sole source of information. It does not allow students to formulate many questions, initiate topics, or challenge one another's thinking. There is no evidence of student inquiry or student contributions. During a lecture, there is no grouping for differentiation. The instructor stands before a class and presents information for the students to learn, but this teaching method tends to get a bad reputation today. The infusion of technology has helped instructors provide a multi-media learning experience by incorporating sound, visuals, activities, and even games into a classroom learning experience and even providing opportunities for flipped classroom formats. Most college courses are lecture-based, and as a result, many high school teachers imitate this style to prepare their students for the college lecture.

Table 2.1. shows the data about the respondents' level of preference on direct instruction or lecture method

Table 2.1. Respondents' Level of Preference on Direct Instruction/Lecture Method

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher ... undertakes some tasks to enable the students to acquire procedural knowledge.	3.26	Highly Preferred
2.	delivers through PowerPoint presentation while undertaking some exercises.	3.32	Highly Preferred
3.	provides ongoing instruction for factual and non-controversial lessons.	3.23	Adequately Preferred
4.	helps the students understand and comprehend the factual aspect of the topic.	3.81	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.41	Highly Preferred

The table above displays the respondents' preferences on the direct instruction or lecture method and the four (4) provisions detailing procedures of the approach. The highest weighted mean of 3.81 indicates that the first-year students highly preferred teaching style when their teacher helped them understand and comprehend the factual aspect of the topic. The students would like their teacher would exert effort to explain more about the subject topics.

On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean of 3.32 denotes that the same groups of respondents also highly preferred that their teacher provide ongoing instruction for factual and non-controversial lessons. The lesson would be easier for the education students to comprehend when the examples are facts.

The data revealed that the freshmen education students had a high preference for direct instruction or lecture methods with a mean rating of 3.23. This result indicates that the respondents expressed that they would like their teacher to explain the lesson inside the class environment explicitly.

Direct instruction is a teacher-directed teaching method. This means that the teacher stands in front of a classroom and presents the information. The teachers give explicit, guided instructions to the students. According to research, direct instruction is one of the most effective teaching strategies. Although often misunderstood, students taught using the direct instruction method perform better in reading, maths, and spelling than those who are not. Direct instruction does not stop at the teacher explaining a concept. Six steps are significant in the introduction, presentation of the new material, guided practice, feedback and correctives, independent practice, and evaluation (Renard, 2019).

Table 2.2 presents the College of Teacher Education students' preference for demonstration teaching methods.

According to Ogwen et al. (2013), the demonstration teaching method is a traditional classroom strategy used in technical and training colleges, even in teacher education. It develops in various ways to make learning permanent. Though teacher behavior is autocratic, he invites pupils' cooperation in the teaching-learning process. It develops an interest in the learners and motivates them for their active participation. This teaching strategy follows the learning by doing maxim, considers skills development by limitation, and utilizes perception to ignite imitation.

Table 2.2 Respondents' Level of Preference on Demonstration Method

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher will show how the process is done while the students are just observers.	3.28	Highly Preferred
2.	The lessons are presented using sophisticated equipment.	3.06	Adequately Preferred
3.	The teacher manifests technical know-how on the modern educational technology.	3.41	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.25	Adequately Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.28 indicates that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher manifests technical know-how on the modern educational technology. This result denotes that the teachers' ability to use computers and technology-enabled instructions is a plus factor in students' learning.

On the other hand, the lowest mean of 3.06 shows that the respondents adequately preferred that the lessons be presented using sophisticated equipment. Usage of high-tech machines would expose the students to a non-traditional world of learning, which is the trend of today's learning.

The aggregate mean of 3.25 shows that the respondents had an adequate preference level towards the demonstration methods. When the teachers would perform a particular activity related to the lesson, the learners would understand the intricacies of the topic.

The word demonstration means to give a demo or to perform the activity. In the demonstration method, the teacher teaches his students using the demonstration method in a systematic and a step by step process. It is a practical way of teaching, wherein the teacher performs an activity to teach his student a concept that often occurs when students find it challenging to connect theories to actual practice and when they cannot understand the theories and their applications (Khan, 2020).

Table 2.3 presents the respondents' level of preference for peer tutoring or peer teaching discussions.

Peer teaching is a design when students teach other students. It enables learners to take responsibility for reviewing, organizing and consolidating existing knowledge and material, understanding its basic structure, filling in the gaps, finding additional meanings, and reformulating knowledge into new conceptual frameworks to enhance learning. It is structured that help from peers increases learning both for the students being helped and those giving the help. For the students being helped, the assistance from their peers enables them to move away from dependence on teachers and gain more opportunities to enhance their learning. For the students giving the help, the cooperative learning groups serve as opportunities to increase their performance. They have the chance to experience and learn that teaching is the best teacher (TeachThought, 2017).

Table 2.3. Respondents' Level of Preference on Peer Tutoring/Peer Teaching

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	There is sharing of ideas among the students in the class.	3.63	Highly Preferred
2.	The teacher requests the older, more matured, and more cooperative student to tutor his/her classmates.	2.83	Adequately Preferred
3.	The teacher assigns the more intelligent student to teach and coach his/her classmates.	2.75	Adequately Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.08	Adequately Preferred

The respondents had an adequate preference for peer tutoring or the peer teaching approach, as indicated by the aggregate mean rating of 3.08. The data disclosed that respondents preferred highly when the teaching approach allowed them to share their ideas before the class based on the highest weighted mean of 3.63. It can be inferred that the students will be able to express their own opinions about the topic in the class and apply their communication and critical thinking skills.

Moreover, the lowest weighted mean of 2.71 shows that the respondents adequately preferred that the teacher assigns the more intelligent student to teach and coach his or her classmates. When the intellectually advanced student would facilitate the learning to those students who experienced struggles in understanding the lesson, they will be able to explain the lesson at the student's level.

The use of peer teaching in the language classroom offers a creative way for students to participate more fully in the learning process and alludes to other related studies that reported that peer taught lessons bring benefits such as improved motivation, enhanced learning, and authentic communication (Teachthought, 2017).

Table 2.3 presents the respondents' level of preference for partner learning.

Table 2.4. Respondents' Level of Preference on Partner Learning

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. enables the students to choose/her partners among their classmates.	3.29	Highly Preferred
2.	permits his/her students to rehearse what they have learned.	3.58	Highly Preferred
3.	allows the students to explore their understanding with their partners.	3.64	Highly Preferred
4.	assign "study buddy" to become responsible for each other's learning .	3.38	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.47	Highly Preferred

The respondents indicated a high preference among the four (4) provisions under partner learning approaches to learning. Specifically, the highest weighted mean of 3.64 indicates that the respondents highly preferred a teaching approach where the teacher allows the students to explore their understanding with their partners. This means that there were students who were comfortable with the learning set-up wherein they had somebody to ask when topics confused them or did not understand.

The lowest weighted mean of 3.29 denotes that the respondents likewise highly preferred when the teachers enable the students to choose their partners among their classmates. One of the factors in learning success is being with a partner that the students are comfortable with. Hence, it is better to give them the freedom to choose his or her partner in studying.

The respondents had a high preference towards the partner learning approach, as evident in the aggregate mean value of 3.47. This means that the students would learn best if their teachers were with them in their learning journey.

Bovill & Bulley (2011) define student-faculty partnership as a "reciprocal process through which all participants have the opportunity to contribute equally, although not necessarily in the same ways, to curricular or pedagogical conceptualization, decision-making, implementation, investigation, or analysis." They suggest that to be successful, the partnership between students and faculty should be based on three principles: respect, reciprocity, and shared responsibility in learning. As the authors argue, these principles fundamentally reshape the relationship that is currently established between faculty and students. Throughout their book, they advocate that both – faculty and students – see each other as peers, as people who can meaningfully (albeit in diverse ways) contribute to the process of teaching and learning.

Table 2.5. shows the data about the respondents' preference level on deductive method of teaching.

Table 2.5. Respondents' Level of Preference on Deductive Method

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. shows/tells his/her students directly what he/she wants to teach.	3.41	Highly Preferred

2.	is the one who dominates the class discussion.	3.36	Highly Preferred
3.	begins with the abstract rule, generalization, principle, and ends with specific examples and concrete details.	3.68	Highly Preferred
4.	chooses and decides all the topics to be tackled in the class.	3.31	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.44	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.68 specifies that the respondents highly preferred that the teacher begins with the abstract rule, generalization, principle and ends with specific examples and concrete details. This result means that the students would be challenged to learn the lesson if the teacher's presentation of the topic is non-concrete since they are curious to more about it.

On the other hand, with the lowest weighted mean of 3.31, the respondents also highly preferred when the teacher chooses and decides all the topics to be tackled in the class. Since the deductive method is a teacher-centered approach, the teacher decides on the lesson to discuss in particular.

The respondents disclosed a high level of preference towards the deductive teaching approach based on the aggregate mean of 3.44. This means that education learners would like their teacher would lay down the rules before presenting the examples.

A deductive approach to teaching language starts by giving learners rules, examples, and practice. It is a teacher-centered approach to presenting new content. This is compared with an inductive approach, which starts with examples and asks learners to find rules and is more learner-centered (British Council, n.d.).

The results above supported the findings of Ali et al. (2018), which mentioned that most of the students preferred the deductive grammar teaching method. Remembering the rules helped the students perform better in the class and validated related works of literature, which argued that explicit prior knowledge of rules helps learners process the input accurately and much faster than if the learners are not given explicit knowledge of grammar. Learners need rules to start with, and the method can still be effective when time and knowledge are limited. The deductive method stressed error corrections and presented rules explicitly.

Discovery teaching and inquiry-based teaching are other strategies associated with Inductive Teaching. As the terms suggest, the learners are provided with opportunities to observe, experience, raise questions, and formulate generalizations from the learning experience that they are exposed to. It is up to the teacher to create and present activities for the students to generate sound generalizations. Furthermore, while the students are exploring, the teacher must guide them to avoid ambiguities.

Table 2.6 shows the respondents' level of preference for the inductive method.

Table 2.6 Respondents' Level of Preference on Inductive Method

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher..demonstrates facilitating skills in the class	3.68	Highly Preferred
2.	empowers the students to formulate the generalization or rule	3.45	Highly Preferred
3.	facilitates the use of the students' analytical way of thinking	3.42	Highly Preferred
4.	enables the students to be more engaged in the teaching-learning process.	3.66	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.55	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.68 specifies that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher demonstrates facilitating skills in the class. In the outcomes-based education model, the teacher will not do

all the talking in the class but will arrange the learning process. Hence, the students will teach themselves how to comprehend the lessons using appropriate teaching-learning materials for the subject topic.

On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean of 3.42 indicates that the respondents also highly preferred when their teacher facilitates using the students' analytical way of thinking. The use of thought-provoking questions during class discussions and activities also challenged the students' comprehension ability.

The aggregate mean of 3.55 shows that the respondents had a high preference for the inductive method in teaching. The new generation of students would like that they will be left on their own during the learning process but with the teacher's guidance.

The results above ascertained the study of Ali et al. (2018), which revealed that students preferred the inductive teaching method because it helped them understand grammar well, promoted critical thinking skills and independent learning, developed long-term memory, and encouraged active learning. The students believed that the method has helped them understand better by discovering rules starting with examples rather than starting with the rules first.

According to Bumbuc et al. (2019), inductive teaching implements the idea that students' sustainable and valuable knowledge is acquired through interaction with reality and phenomena. It is the responsibility of teachers to create opportunities and a proper context for confronting students with the reality of the professions in the classroom or virtual space. Multimedia means that the verbal evocation of situations or direct experimentation can be used if the institution's facilities allow this. The correct completion of generalizations at the end of inductive teaching is essential so that students do not only solve particular cases and make inappropriate conclusions due to particular anchoring in concrete. Thinking must be rigorously conducted towards relevant ideas that allow students to apply them in various professional and life contexts.

Table 2.7 Respondents' Level of Preference on Preferred Teaching Approaches

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
I.	Lecture Method	3.41	Highly Preferred	4th
II.	Demonstration Method	3.25	Adequately Preferred	5th
III.	Peer Teaching	3.08	Adequately Preferred	6th
IV.	Partner Learning	3.47	Highly Preferred	2nd
V.	Deductive Method	3.44	Highly Preferred	3rd
VI.	Inductive Method	3.55	Highly Preferred	1st
	Grand Mean	3.37	Highly Preferred	

Of the six methods of teaching assessed in this study, the respondents rated four (4) highly preferred approaches and two adequately-preferred approaches. Specifically, the highest aggregate mean of 3.55 specifies that the respondents highly preferred the inductive teaching approach. This means that the students enrolled in the College of Teachers Education (CTE) expressed a high preference towards when the instructional technique applied noticing instead of explaining the concepts to them directly.

The lowest aggregate means of 3.08 shows that the respondents also adequately preferred peer teaching. Peer teaching requires a partner in learning or somebody who can explain the topic to the students who are struggling to comprehend, which is hard to materialize in higher education.

Overall, the grand mean of 3.37 shows that the respondents highly preferred various teaching approaches such as lecture, partner learning, deductive, and inductive. It can be inferred that the Bachelor of Elementary education and Bachelor of Secondary Education students have different preferences regarding the teaching approaches since each topic or lesson requires a different kind of teaching approach.

The critical thing to realize is that how teachers view their role and goals as teachers has a considerable impact on how they structure their teaching. It is crucial to remember that various approaches are conceptions of teaching; they are ideas about what teaching is and should be. They are also open to appraisal and criticism, adoption, rejection, or modification. There are three different perspectives that contemporary education has used to conceive of teaching activity in ways that will help in doing better. Indeed, in this sense, they are more like lenses through which to explore and understand the various teaching activities, and they are hard-and-fast categories for how to teach. This lens analogy helps think about the approaches to teaching (Fenstermacher & Soltis, 2009).

This section presents the respondents' preference level for the different teaching strategies. Table 3.1 shows the respondents' preference level for brainstorming as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.1. Respondents' Level of Preference on Brainstorming as a Teaching Strategy

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher... actively involves learners in higher levels of learning.	3.10	Adequately Preferred
2.	promotes peer learning and creates synergy.	3.22	Adequately Preferred
3.	promotes critical thinking.	3.40	Highly Preferred
4.	helps groups each consensus.	3.32	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.26	Highly Preferred

Table 3.1 shows that the highest weighted mean of 3.40 highly preferred that their teacher promotes critical thinking. This means that the education students would like to actively and skillfully conceptualize, apply, analyze, synthesize, and/or evaluate information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action.

While the lowest weighted mean adequately preferred that their teacher actively involves learners in higher levels of learning. The students would like to take the challenge of learning involving concept formation, connecting, and visualization.

The freshmen education students highly preferred brainstorming as a teaching strategy as implied by its aggregate mean of 3.26. The respondents highly preferred this teaching strategy because it promoted critical thinking and helped in sorting consensus. In teacher education, the strategy was among those recognized that provided structured, analytical processes in solving problems paving the group to acquire limited and creative ideas.

Almutairi (2015) mentioned that brainstorming provides a free and open environment that encourages everyone to participate. It combines a relaxed, informal approach to problem-solving with lateral thinking. It encourages people to come up with thoughts and ideas that can, at first, seem a bit crazy. Ideas are welcomed and built upon, and all participants are encouraged to contribute fully, helping them develop a rich array of creative solutions. This helps to get learners unstuck by "jolting" them out of their typical ways of thinking. In brainstorming sessions, learners should avoid criticizing or rewarding ideas to lessen the possibilities of breaking down incorrect assumptions about the problem's limits. Judgment and analysis at this stage stunts idea generation and limit creativity. Evaluate ideas at the end of the session – this is the time to explore solutions further, using conventional approaches.

Simulations provide opportunities to extend and enhance the practice, feedback, and assessment provided during teacher education. A simulation is a simplified but accurate, valid, and dynamic model of reality. A simulation allows users to encounter problem situations, test decisions and actions, experience the results, and modify behavior cost-effectively and without risking harm. Simulations may or may not be implemented using digital technologies but increasingly take advantage of them to provide more realism, flexibility, access, and detailed feedback (Kaufman & Ireland, 2019).

Table 3.2. shows the respondents' preference level for simulation as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.2. Respondents' Level of Preference on Simulation as a Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. portray realistic situations.	3.44	Highly Preferred
2.	allows focused learning that eliminates irrelevant aspects.	3.13	Moderately Preferred
3.	improves the likelihood of transfer of learning from the classroom to the real world.	3.40	Highly Preferred
4.	provides immediate feedback.	3.40	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.34	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.44 indicates that the respondents preferred that their teacher portray realistic situations. The students would better understand the lessons once they are presented with situations close to reality.

Simulation is a teaching strategy that aims to provide an experience as close to the 'real thing' as possible. It is contextualized in imitating real-world activities and processes in a safe environment. Learners can reset the scenario and try alternative strategies and approaches through a simulated activity. It allows the learners to experience specific situations by applying their more comprehensive learning and knowledge. The approach is frequently used in disciplines where students need to develop skills and experience, but safety issues or cost considerations prevent this from happening in the real-world (Glover, 2014).

The lowest weighted mean of 3.13 specifies that the respondents moderately preferred that the teacher allows focused learning that eliminates irrelevant aspects. To ensure that the learners comprehend the subject topic if the manner of presenting is direct to point and does not include insignificant details.

The aggregate mean of 3.34 exemplified the respondents' high preference for simulation as a teaching strategy. This means that the education students in the university that the teachers' strategic in teaching involves activities like role-playing or playing some roles without any preliminary training.

The simulation features to portray realistic situations, greater chances of the likelihood transfer of learning from the classroom to the real world, and the provision for immediate feedback were the factors the respondents were exceptionally attuned to.

Glover (2014) declared that simulation is a dynamic rather than a fixed experience. It exposed learners to the scenario changing realistically according to their actions and the participants adapting to changes to the scenario. A simulation is a mechanism for learners to obtain real-time feedback on their actions. Learners are fully immersed in the scenario for a while.

Simulations have many advantages for learning and practice, including repeating scenarios with specific learning objectives, practicing for more extended periods than are available in life, using trial and error, experience rate or risky situations, and measuring outcomes with validated scoring systems. For skills development, a simulation's outcomes measures, combined with debriefing and reflection, serve as feedback for a formative assessment cycle of repeated performance practice and improvement Kaufman & Ireland, 2019).

Table 3.3. shows the respondents' preference level for demonstration as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.3 Respondents' Level of Preference on Demonstration as a Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1	The teacher will.. helps people who learn well by modeling others.	3.25	Adequately Preferred
2	promotes self-confidence.	3.64	Highly Preferred
3	provide the opportunity for target questions and answers.	3.42	Highly Preferred
4	allows attention to be focused on specific details rather than general theories.	3.34	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.41	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.64 indicates that the respondents highly preferred that their teachers promote confidence in the class. In many cases, the teacher's learner should ensure that their children have the self-confidence to succeed in learning. Without self-confidence, they would lose motivation towards learning if they faced hardships with complex learning tasks.

On the opposite, the lowest weighted mean of 3.25, they adequately preferred when their teacher helps people who learn well by modeling others. Using the learning achievement of other students, other students would be motivated to learn.

As shown by the aggregate mean of 3.41, the respondents highly preferred demonstration because it follows step by step and simple way of presenting the lesson. Also, the students would find it easy to comprehend the topic since visual aids are used during the discussions.

Khan (2020) explained that demonstration means giving a demo or performing the activity. In the demonstration method, the teacher teaches his students using the demonstration method in a systematic and a step by step process. The demonstration includes the stages of introduction, development, and integration. In the introduction stage, the teacher clarifies the learning objective and actively demonstrates what learners must accomplish to achieve the objective. Then provides the learners the opportunity to demonstrate action, receive feedback, and continue working on the activity until the skill is mastered. The integration stage requires that the teacher plan for students to practice using these skills, offering continued feedback and evaluation.

Table 3.4. shows the respondents' preference level for lecture or presentation as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.4. Respondents' Level of Preference on Lectures/Presentation Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher... provide new information and clarify existing information to a large heterogeneous group in a short period .	3.21	Adequately Preferred
2.	cover underlying concepts, principles, and system.	3.21	Adequately Preferred

3.	set the stage and lay the necessary groundwork and parameters for a subsequent activity.	3.12	Adequately Preferred
4.	stimulate learner interest in future study.	3.50	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.26	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.50 denotes that the respondents highly preferred a teaching strategy where the teacher stimulates learner interest in the future study. The teacher needs to ignite the students' interest more about the subject.

The lowest weighted mean of 3.12 indicates that the respondents adequately preferred that the teacher set the stage and lay the necessary groundwork and parameters for subsequent activity. In the context of effective teaching, the teacher has to plan all the lessons and each teaching approach so that there is a smooth flow of the learning process.

The aggregate mean of 3.26 shows that the respondents highly preferred lecture or presentation teaching. This means that the learners appreciate when the teacher deliver new information, expound existing information in the class and uncover underlying concepts, principles, system about the topic.

The study findings of Ameh et al. (2012) showed that the boys and girls are better in academic achievement when taught using the demonstration method than when the lecture method was used. The demonstration method shows equality in the performance of boys and girls. Hence the adoption of demonstration methods in the teaching and learning of chemistry and science, in general, was recommended.

Table 3.5. shows the respondents' preference level for questioning as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.5. Respondents' Preference on Questioning as a Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. puts the burden of learning on the students and increases learner involvement.	2.95	Adequately Preferred
2.	provides both learning and teaching immediate feedback.	3.36	Highly Preferred
3.	guides learners to higher levels of thinking and inquiry.	3.35	Highly Preferred
4.	helps students identify and build on pre-existing knowledge.	3.51	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.28	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.51 indicates the respondents highly preferred a teaching strategy where the teachers helps students identify and build on pre-existing knowledge. It is very important for the teaching to assess the current knowledge of the students before exposing them to the new lesson which required higher learning capabilities so that the teaching approach would fit their competence.

The lowest weighted mean of 2.95 indicates that the respodnents adequately preferred a teaching strategy that puts the burden of learning on the students and increases learner involvement. The essence of outcomes-based education is to give the students the opportunity to work for their learning over the subject with the guidance of the teacher.

The aggregate mean of 3.28 denotes that the respondents highly preferred questioning as a teaching strategy. The first-year education students would like that their teacher would ask them questions that would ignite their interest over the topic because it would lead them to higher levels of thinking and inquiry.

Research indicates that asking questions is second only to lecturing. Teachers typically spend anywhere from 35 to 50 percent of their instructional time asking questions. eachers ask questions for a variety of purposes, including: to actively involve students in the lesson, to increase motivation or interest, to evaluate students'

preparation, to check on completion of work, to develop critical thinking skills, to review previous lessons, to nurture insights, to assess achievement or mastery of goals and objectives, and to stimulate independent learning. A teacher may vary his or her purpose in asking questions during a single lesson, or a single question may have more than one purpose (Ohio State University, n.d.).

Table 3.6. shows the respondents' preference level for self-study as a teaching strategy

Table 3.6. Respondents' Preference on Self-Study as a Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher... fosters independent learning skills.	3.23	Highly Preferred
2.	enhances other learning experiences.	3.54	Highly Preferred
3.	provides the opportunity for a learner to obtain prerequisites knowledge.	3.54	Highly Preferred
4.	allows for flexible, individual schedules and self-pacing.	3.40	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.43	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.54 specifies that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher enhances other learning experiences. When the teacher's strategy enabled the learners to connect their past learning experience to the current topic, they would appreciate the concept and the essence of the lesson more.

Another weighted mean of 3.54 shows that the respondents highly preferred when their teacher provided an opportunity to learn prerequisites and enhanced other learning experiences. Allowing the students to discover their capability with flexibility is the significance of an independent learning strategy.

Moreover, the lowest weighted mean of 3.23 also indicates that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher fosters independent learning skills. Promoting independence in learning is significant for students who can control their study activities inside and outside the classroom environment.

The aggregate mean of 3.43 shows that the respondents highly preferred self-study as a teaching strategy. Some students prefer to discover the information, concepts, and theories when they direct their learning process at their pace.

Self-directed learning (SDL) is an appropriate and preferred learning process to prepare students for lifelong learning in their professions and make them stay up-to-date. Self-directed learners have adequate accountability to select the content to be studied, assign time for it, and understand the content deeply using any method both inside and outside class (Kaufman, 2003).

Table 3.7. shows the respondents' preference level for case study as a teaching strategy.

Case studies is an instructional method (not a theory) that refers to assigned scenarios based on situations in which students observe, analyze, record, implement, conclude, summarize, or recommend. Case studies are created and used as a tool for analysis and discussion.

Table 3.7. Respondents' Preference on Case Studies as Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. actively involves participants and stimulates peer group learning.	3.21	Adequately Preferred
2.	helps participants explore pre-existing knowledge and build on what they know.	3.42	Highly Preferred

3.	promotes development of critical thinking skills.	3.39	Highly Preferred
4.	develop leadership, teamwork, communication, and collaboration skills.	3.63	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.41	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.63 shows that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher developed leadership, teamwork, communication, and collaboration skills. In solving the case, the teacher usually arranges the class in groups with a leader and members. Cooperative coordination among learners will be developed and enhanced, useful for future learning activities and work.

The lowest weighted mean of 3.21 specifies that the respondents adequately preferred that the teacher actively involves participants and stimulates peer group learning. Understanding the intricacies of the case and looking for a sound solution requires more than one person to think. Hence, the case study somehow is effective for groups of students.

The aggregate means of 3.41 respondents highly preferred case studies as a teaching strategy because it enhances the abilities of the students to work in teams, build their leadership talents, enable them to communicate among the team members, and collaborate with other internal and external stakeholders of the issue if needed. It can be used as a springboard to explore prior knowledge and develop something from it. In addition, it can develop critical thinking skills.

The results above affirmed the findings of the study conducted by Pilato et al. (2014), which mentioned that the case studies proved to be very successful overall, especially having consultation sessions which gave students the ability to rework certain parts and polish their presentations before standing in front of the professionals. The students had sufficient academic ability to approach the topics of the case studies and conduct research.

The case method is a participatory, discussion-based way of learning where students gain critical thinking, communication, and group dynamics skills. It is a type of problem-based learning. Often seen in the professional schools of medicine, law, and business, the case method is now used successfully in engineering, chemistry, education, and journalism. Students can work through a case during class as a whole or in small groups. In addition, the case method of teaching (or learning): is a partnership between students and teacher as well as among students, promotes more effective contextual learning and long-term retention, involves trust that students will find the answers, answers questions not only of “how” but “why” and provides students the opportunity to “walk around the problem” and to see varied perspectives (Bruner, 2002; Christensen et al., 1991).

Table 3.8. shows the respondents' preference level for collaborative learning as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.8. Collaborative Learning as Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. promote critical thinking.	3.43	Highly Preferred
2.	involves students actively in the learning process.	3.50	Highly Preferred
3.	models appropriate student problem-solving techniques.	3.28	Highly Preferred
4.	helpful in motivating students in specific curriculum.	3.48	Highly Preferred
	Aggregate Mean	3.42	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.48 indicates that the respondents highly preferred that the teacher helps motivate students in a specific curriculum. Learning motivation is ignited when the teacher directly supports the students' effort in uncovering knowledge relating to the topic.

The lowest weighted mean of 3.28 indicates that the respondents preferred a teaching strategy where the teacher models appropriate student problem-solving techniques. The students will appreciate the essence of the technique when the teacher uses a very relevant model in which reality can be easily connected. So when the student would experience or observe the same situation in the future, they would know how to resolve the issue.

Overall, the aggregate mean of 3.42 shows that the respondents highly preferred collaborative learning as a teaching strategy because it actively involves them in the learning journey. They will be motivated to learn content in the curriculum and apply critical thinking to solve the problems.

The findings above uphold the statement of Chioran (2017) statement, who views that collaborative learning best happens when learners are actively involved in a project, encouraged to create groups and work together to solve a given problem.

Table 3.9. shows the respondents' preference level for 4A's as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.9. 4A's as a Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. activate students prior knowledge.	3.41	Highly Preferred
2.	enables the learners to acquire new knowledge.	3.59	Highly Preferred
3.	apply relevant learning to a real-life situation.	3.58	Highly Preferred
4.	assess what has been learned and what needs to be further developed.	3.59	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.54	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.59 specifies that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher enables the learners to acquire new knowledge. The reason why student goes to school is to acquire higher and specific knowledge to their pursued discipline. Thereby, the teaching strategy should hone their abilities to grasp more complex knowledge in education.

Another highest weighted mean of 3.59 specifies that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher assess what has been learned and what needs to be further developed. To be able to determine most fitted teaching approach and the coverage and focus of the lesson, the teacher should undertake pre assessment of the student current knowledge level of the course.

On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean of 3.41 specifies that the respondents highly preferred when the teacher activate students prior knowledge. To enable the students connect their past lesson to the current one the effective needs to use a teaching strategy that would scaffold the hierarchy of knowledge over the lessons in the course.

The respondents highly preferred the 4A's teaching strategy as evident in the aggregate mean of 3.54. This implied that the respondents perceived that the strategy was highly preferred because of the teacher lead the students build their past knowledge, connect it to the new one and even to the real-life situations And the most important learning outcomes is the ability of the students to determine the lessons learned.

According to Lindee (2019) activating prior knowledge enables students to make important connections to past learning and prepare their brains for new content. New content is presented and taught, then applied to real-world or past situations. Finally, an assessment is given to determine student understanding. Let's dig a bit deeper into these components.

Table 3.10. shows the respondents' preference level for 4A's as a teaching strategy.

Table 3.10. Cooperative Learning as a Teaching Strategy

Indicators		Mean	Interpretation
1.	The teacher.. encourage involvement of students in higher level.	3.28	Highly Preferred
2.	Employs mechanism wherein the knowledge to be obtained from the students rather than solely from the teacher.	3.33	Highly Preferred
3.	foster positive attitude in the students such as cooperation, tolerance.	3.53	Highly Preferred
4.	trains students to express or convey ideas.	3.56	Highly Preferred
Aggregate Mean		3.43	Highly Preferred

The highest weighted mean of 3.56 indicates that the respondents highly preferred a teaching strategy wherein the teacher trains students to express or convey ideas. In cooperating learning, learning about the topic or lesson comes from exchanging ideas between the teacher and the students.

The lowest weighted mean of 3.33 specifies that the respondents highly preferred a teaching strategy wherein the teacher employs a mechanism wherein the knowledge be obtained from the students rather than solely from the teacher. In outcomes-based education adopted by the university, the teacher will facilitate the learning process, while the students will perform activities and tasks that would enable them to understand the lesson.

The aggregate mean of 3.43 indicates that the respondents highly preferred cooperative teaching strategy due to its features that train students to express or convey ideas, foster positive attitudes such as cooperation and tolerance, learners could be the source of knowledge and require active involvement.

Cooperative learning is also called small-group learning. It is an instructional strategy in which all groups of students work together on a standard task. The task can be as simple as solving a multi-step math problem together or as complex as developing a design for a new kind of school. In some cases, each group member is individually accountable for part of the task; in others, group members work together without formal role assignments (TeacherVision Staff, n.d.).

Table 3.11. shows the summarized data about the respondents' preference on the various teaching strategies. The highest aggregate mean of 3.54 indicates that the respondents highly preferred 4A's teaching strategies. Their preferences relates to the technicalities of this teaching strategy whrein if follows proper procedure like acquiring of new knowledge, assessments, activation of perior knowledge, and application.

Table 3.11. Summarized Data on the Respondents' Preference on Teaching Strategies

	Indicators	Mean	Interpretation	Rank
I.	Brainstorming	3.26	Highly Preferred	8th
II.	Simulation	3.34	Highly Preferred	6th
III.	Demonstration	3.41	Highly Preferred	5th
IV.	Lectures and Presentations	3.26	Highly Preferred	8th
V.	Questioning	3.28	Highly Preferred	7th
VI.	Self-Study	3.43	Highly Preferred	2nd
VII.	Case Studies	3.41	Highly Preferred	5th
VIII.	Collaborative Learning	3.42	Highly Preferred	4th
IX.	4A's	3.54	Highly Preferred	1st
X.	Cooperative Learning Strategies	3.43	Highly Preferred	2nd
	Overall Aggregate Mean	3.38	Highly Preferred	

However, the lowest aggregate means of 3.26 denotes that the respondents still highly preferred brainstorming, lectures and presentations teaching strategies. Although the education students appreciate the

importance of applying brainstorming in learning because this entails higher learning skills but it is quite complex and difficult for ordinary learners.

Moreover, their choice of lectures and presentations of their teacher relates to the fact the the teachers will do the talking and discussion about the lessons, while the students will just listen and comprehend. So the burden of the work lies in the hands of the teachers but it is quite boring.

The overall aggregate mean of 3.38 denotes that the respodents highly preferred the various teaching strategies such as 4a's, self-study, cooperative learning strategies, collaborative, case sudies, demonstration, simulation, questionning, lectures and presentations, and brainstorming. The respondents' ratings unveiled a unimodal level of preferences to each of the teaching strategies under consideration. This connoted that there were no variations in the respondents' assessment as far as categorization of responses is concerned.

Teaching as a science views the teachers as an academician as well as a craftsman. Teaching as an art goes beyng the prescribed level of instruction. This facet views the teacher as an innovators, one who is willing to modify and to create a new forms of teaching. The teachers' artistry comes in when they consider varying mixture of these young people and through processes that are basically intuitive build up meaningful programs of study for them. These teachers believe teaching requires an ability to see through and respond to individual differences among the learners (Acero et al., 2000).

Table 4.1. presents the results on the test of significant relationship between the age of the respondents and their level of preference to teaching strategies.

Table 4.1. Significant Relationship Between the Age of the Respondents and their Level of Preference to Teaching Strategies

Paired Variables Age and;	Computed Chi-Square	df	P- Values	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Brainstorming	0.942	6	0.942	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
2. Simulation	13.120	6	0.041	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship
3. Demonstration	6.129	6	0.409	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
4. Lectures and Presentations	7.509	6	0.276		
5. Questioning	16.704	6	0.010	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship
6. Self-Study	8.072	6	0.233	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
7. Case Studies	4.972	6	0.547		
8. Collaborative Learning	16.704	6	0.010	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship
9. 4As	6.239	6	0.397	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
10. Cooperative Learning Strategies	7.191	6	0.304		
Teaching Methods/Strategies	2.359	4	0.670		

To determine a significant relationship between the age of the respondents and their preferred learning styles, a Chi-square test of independence was computed. The table revealed that the age of the respondents had a significant relationship with their preferred teaching styles as to simulation, questioning, and collaborative learning. This result meant that the respondents' responses to the latter learning styles were not due to random chance.

On the contrary, the age profile of the first-year education students had no significant relationship with the learning styles such as brainstorming, demonstration, lectures/presentation, self-study, case studies, 4A's, and the cooperative learning styles. This signified that the paired variables had no associations.

Table 4.2. presents the results on the test of significant relationship between the gender of the respondents and their level of preference to teaching strategies.

Table 4.2. Test of Significant Relationship Between the Gender of the Respondents and their Level of Preference to Teaching Strategy

Paired Variables Gender and;	Computed Chi-Square	df	P- Values	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
1. Brainstorming	3.577	3	0.311	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
2. Simulation	6.302	3	0.098		
3. Demonstration	2.630	3	0.452		
4. Lectures and Presentations	0.351	3	0.950		
5. Questioning	0.303	3	0.959		
6. Self-Study	2.427	3	0.489		
7. Case Studies	2.560	3	0.465		
8. Collaborative Learning	0.303	3	0.959		
9. 4A's	2.265	3	0.519		
10. Cooperative Learning Strategies	4.412	3	0.220		
Preferred Teaching Method/Strategies	2.583	2	0.275		

The results signified that the gender of the respondents had no association with the preferred teaching methods since the P-values are lesser than the computed Chi-square. Thereby, whether the student is male or female, their preference on the teaching methods and strategies did not vary.

Table 4.3. presents the results on the test of significant relationship between age of the respondents and their level of preference on the teaching approaches.

Table 4.3. Test of Significant Relationship between Age of the Respondents and their Level of Preference on the Teaching Approaches/Strategies

Paired Variables Age and;	Computed Chi-Square	df	P- Values	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
A. Lecture Method/DI	1.740	6	0.942	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
B. Demonstration Method	5.676	6	0.460		
C. Peer Teaching	4.490	6	0.611		
D. Partner Learning	5.083	6	0.533		
E. Deductive Method	1.656	6	0.948		
F. Inductive Method	2.359	4	0.670		
Teaching Approaches	2.495	2	0.287		

The probability values of each paired variable were all greater than 0.05 which led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This signified that the age of the respondents had no significant relationship with their preference for the teaching approaches. The variation on the age among the educations students did not have association with the type of teaching approaches of their teachers on the various courses.

Table 4.4. presents the results on the test of significant relationship between gender of the respondents and their preferred teaching approaches.

Table 4.4. Test of Significant Relationship Between Gender of the Respondents and their Preferred Teaching Approaches

Paired Variables Gender and;	Computed Square	Chi- df	P- Values	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
I. Lecture Method/DI	3.577	3	0.311	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
II. Demonstration Method	9.280	3	0.026	Reject Ho	Significant Relationship
III. Peer Teaching	4.742	3	0.192	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
IV. Partner Learning	0.782	3	0.854	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
V. Deductive Method	1.401	3	0.705	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
VI. Inductive Method	2.583	2	0.275	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship
Teaching Approaches	0.497	1	0.481	Accept Ho	No Significant Relationship

The results communicated that the gender of the respondents had no significant relationship with their assessment in the teaching approaches as indicated in the probability values greater than 0.05, except for the demonstration method with probability values of 0.026. This suggested that of the six (6) teaching approaches under consideration, the data on the gender of the respondents had a significant relationship only to the demonstration approach to learning.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the respondents were limited to first-year education students enrolled during the school year 2018–2019; therefore, the findings may not be directly generalizable to students in higher year levels or to more recent cohorts. Second, the study employed purposive sampling, which limits the generalizability of the findings beyond the participants included in the study. Third, the data reflect the teaching-style preferences of the respondents at the time the study was conducted and may not fully represent current students' preferences. These limitations should be considered when applying the findings to other teacher education contexts.

CONCLUSION

The Bachelor of Elementary Education and Bachelor of Secondary Education education students expressed a clear preference toward the combination of learner-centered and teacher-directed teaching approaches. It was also evident in their preference for teaching methodologies. Most of them are ready and willing to accept a change. Although the number of participants in this study, their age, and gender was limited to first-year students only, it appears that the first-year students are not that interested in being passive learners in the classroom and would prefer to be more actively involved in the learning process. If these learners are allowed to be more actively involved and if the formats of all education courses are more student-centered—focusing on the needs and abilities of the learners—then the change that could take place could be very empowering for the students. They could become more autonomous learners, gain more self-confidence in their abilities, and gain more cooperative social skills, which could help them become better team players at their future teaching jobs. This result is aligned with..

RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers should make adjustments to their teaching styles to match diverse groups of students and individuals within a group. Teachers unfamiliar with the student-centered approach can learn more about this

and adopt teaching methodologies that better focus on the learners' needs. Moreover, adopt a new approach to teaching and add new teaching methodologies intended for mixed-ability learners. Allow students more responsibility and ownership for their learning and provide opportunities for more peer interaction. Let students design tasks that give them some direct input on how tasks should be assessed or considered good or acceptable.

Furthermore, teachers should make their classrooms more student-centered by designing lessons and tasks that allow students to demonstrate their comprehension and abilities in various modalities. Conduct a peer-led team learning where knowledgeable and experienced students lead a group of less knowledgeable and experienced students through various tasks. Two more student-centered teaching methods that teachers can apply in their classrooms are problem-based learning (PBL) and active learning. Essentially, PBL is when a problem leads to learning (Woods, 1994). Usually, working in small groups, students must engage in a complex and challenging problem that requires them to evaluate what they already know and what they need to know to solve the problem. Active-learning tasks could include class discussions, group work, debating, think-pair-share tasks, and writing. Teachers who adopt the student-centered teaching approach should be more like a coach, a mentor, or a facilitator of acquiring knowledge.

LITERATURES CITED

1. Acero, V. O., Javier, E.S., Castro, H. O. (2000). Principles and strategies of teaching. Manila, Philippines: Rex Books Store. Retrieved February 7, 2021 <https://bit.ly/3rA3Q7d>.
2. Almutairi, A. N. M. (2015). The effects of using brainstorming in developing creative problem-solving skills among male students in Kuwait: A field study on Saudi Al- Kharji school in Kuwait City. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(3). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3u48BYj>.
3. Ameh, P. O., & Dantani Y.S. (2012). Effects of lecture and demonstration methods on the academic achievement of students in chemistry in Nassarawa local government area of Kano State. *International Journal of Modern Social Sciences*, 1(1), 29-37. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3IKWNhJ>.
4. Baker, S., Santoro, L., Chard, D., Fien, H., Park, Y., & Otterstedt, J. (2013). An evaluation of an explicit read-aloud intervention in whole-classroom formats in first grade. *The Elementary School Journal*, 113(3), 331-358. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3H85stV>.
5. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university. New York: Open University Press.
6. Bovill, C., & Bulley, C J. (2011). A model of active student participation in curriculum design: exploring desirability and possibility. In *Improving student learning (isl) 18: global theories and local practices: institutional, disciplinary and cultural variations*, edited by C Rust, 176-188. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University Center for Staff and Learning Development.
7. Bumbuc, S., & Macovei, C. (2019). Inductive approach in higher education. Presented during the International Conference on Knowledge-Based Organization, 15(2), 220-224. Doi: [10.2478/kbo-2019-0084](https://doi.org/10.2478/kbo-2019-0084).
8. British Council. (n.d.). Deductive approach. Teaching Knowledge Database. Retrieved February 5, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/3HwOLc4>.
9. Bruner, R. (2002). *Socrates' muse: Reflections on effective case discussion leadership*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
10. Chioran, A. (2017). Why is collaborative learning important? National User Interface Technologies AB (NUITEQ). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3IDouc8>.
11. Christensen, C. R., Garvin, D. A., & Sweet, A. (Eds.). (1991). *Education for judgment: The artistry of discussion leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
12. Corpuz, B. & Salandanan, G. (2015). *Principles of teaching*. Quezon City: Lorimar Publishing Company.
13. Corpuz, B., Lucas M. A., Borabo, H.G. & Lucido, P. (2018). *The child and adolescent learners and learning principles*. Quezon City: Lorimar Publishing Company.

14. Derrel, T. (2015). Teaching methods and strategies: What's your style? American Intercontinental University. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3rtqvLS>.
15. Fenstermacher, G. D. & Soltis, J.F. (2009). Approaches to teaching (5th ed.). Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N.Y.: Teachers College Press Columbia University.
16. Kaufman, D.M. (2003). ABC of learning and teaching in medicine: applying educational theory in practice. BMJ, 326(7382), 213–6. Retrieved February 7, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/3J8dcwI>.
17. Kaufman, D., & Ireland, A. (2019). Simulation as a strategy in teacher education. Education. Oxford Research Encyclopedia. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.478>.
18. Khan, S.M. (2020). Demonstration method. Education Awareness and Research. Retrieved February 5, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/335Fc4S>.
19. Ogwen, P., Kathuri, N., & Nkurumwa, A. (2021). Effects of problem based learning method and demonstration teaching method on secondary students agriculture achievement in Ndhiwa Sub-county, Kenya. African Journal of Education and Practice, 7(2). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.47604/ajep.1250>.
20. Glover, I. (2014). Simulation: An approach to teaching and learning. Technology Enhanced Learning at SHU. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3FZAS4I>.
21. Howard, M. (2018). Direct instruction teaching method: Definition, examples, and strategies. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/35IVMy1>.
22. Malipot, M. (2019) Has change come to Philippine education? Manila Bulletin. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/31t0Mz6>.
23. McGonigal, K. (2005). Teaching for transformation: From learning theory to teaching strategies. Speaking of Teaching Newsletter, 14(2). Center for Teaching Center for Teaching and Learning. Stanford University. Retrieved February 5, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/3LgLLw8>.
24. Mermelstein, A. D. (2015). Asian EFL University students' preference toward teaching approaches. The CATESOL Journal, 27(2), 259-279. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32zDPLo>.
25. Muhammed Ali, C.P., Joshi, P., & Hareesh, S. (2018). Omani EFL students' preference of grammar teaching method. Language in India, 18(1), pl. 21. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/32BfCV9>.
26. Ohio State University. (n.d.). Questioning techniques: Research-based strategies for teachers. College of Education and Human Ecology. Retrieved February 5, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/3Lk86zu>.
27. Orlich, D.C., Harder, R.J., Callahan, R.C., Trevisan, M.S., Brown, A. H., & Miller, D. E. (2013). Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction (10th ed.). Wadsworth CENGAGE Learning. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3sjcKFk>.
28. Pilato, B. & Ulrich, M. (2014). Is the case study method an effective pedagogical method for students to learn the fundamentals of financial accounting? San Diego: Americal Society of Business and Behavioral Sciences (ASBBS) Proceedings, 21(1). Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3G5H4ru>.
29. Price, P. C., Jhangiana, R., Chiang, I-Chant, Leighton, D. C. & Cuttler, C. (n.d.). Correlational research. Pressbook. Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3gfPSAC>.
30. Renard, L. (2019). Direct instruction - A practical guide to effective teaching. Book Widgets Interactive Learning. Retrieved February 4, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/3uvNT3z>.
31. Richmond, A. S., & Cummings, R. (2005). Implementing Kolb's learning styles into online distance education. International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning, 1(1), 45-54. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3ohVILE>.
32. Rungduin, T. M., Rico, M. C., & Aggarao, M. L. (2021). Facilitating learner-centered teaching (2021 ed.). Quezon City: Rex Bookstore Inc.
33. Rupley, W. (2009). Introduction to direct/explicit instruction in reading for the struggling reader: Phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Reading & Writing Quarterly, 25(2-3), 119-124. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573560802690189>.
34. TeachThought Staff. (2017). The definition of peer teaching. TeachThought University. Retrieved February 7, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/35u1huH>.
35. TeacherVision Staff. (n.d.). Cooperative learning. Retrieved February 7, 2021 from <https://bit.ly/3oxkW3x>.

36. Unal, Z., & Unal, A. (2017). Comparison of student performance, student perception, and teacher satisfaction with traditional versus flipped classroom models. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(4), 145–164. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3Hlsiyh>.
37. Weegar, A. & Pacis, D. (2012). A comparison of two theories of learning – behaviorism, and constructivism as applied to face-to-face and online learning. *E-Leader Manila*. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3oltZVH>.