The Landscape of Teaching Music, Arts, Physical Education and Health (MAPEH) in Times of Systemic Global Dysfunction

Randyll V. Villones
Philippine Normal University Visayas, Negros Occidental, Philippines
villones.rv@pnu.edu.ph

Abstract – The covid-19 pandemic has caused numerous global issues and challenges. Many countries' educational momentum has been poorly disrupted, forcing students to adjust to new learning modalities. This situation has triggered the researcher to study the landscape of teaching MAPEH in times of systemic global dysfunction among junior high school teachers in the second district of the Province of Negros Occidental. Specifically, this academic study investigated the teachers' preferred teaching styles and learning delivery modalities. The study utilized a mixed-method design administered to the 135 Junior High School MAPEH teachers-respondents using the survey questionnaire developed by the researcher. The study's findings revealed that the preferred teaching style of most teachers was the Hybrid or Blended. The most preferred learning delivery modality was Modular Distance Learning (MDL) regardless of the subject areas and the grade levels. On the other hand, qualitative responses indicate that teachers' teaching styles have influenced in some ways to teachers' LDM. Along this line, due to the variety of grade levels, subject areas, learning styles of students, and even learning outcomes, teachers have to deviate their teaching styles to consider all of these factors. Thus, it is implied that MAPEH teachers must shift their learning delivery modalities to complement the teaching styles to help students maximize their learning in the new normal.

Keywords – Global Dysfunction, Physical Education, Teaching

INTRODUCTION

Since the onset of this systemic global dysfunction, or so-called global pandemic, which disrupted all aspects of life in the worldwide community, the World Health Organization declared a pandemic on March 11, 2020, pointing to over 118,000 cases of coronavirus infection in over 110 countries and territories around the world, as well as the continued global, spread [1].

Almost half of all the students worldwide were affected by partial or complete school closures because of the pandemic. United Nations Educational, Scientific & Cultural Organization (UNESCO) [2] estimates that over 1.6 billion children and youth cannot attend school for months. As a result, education should be prioritized to avoid COVID-19's negative consequences on learning quality.

Many countries, including the Philippines, have moved away from classroom education and toward online learning platforms. Governments have pushed mobile learning as an effective way for students to continue their education. This effort has aided the growth of online learning systems [3]. The pandemic has also completely revolutionized how people lived and prospered previously. Such innovations have altered the global academic scene. Additionally, Snelling & Fingal [4] also uttered that shifting online before COVID-19 investigated the prospect of online classrooms as part of future education.

Staying fit and healthy is critical in these challenging times. How is MAPEH subject taught effectively to ensure that safety and health are consistently emphasized to all students, particularly youngsters in society's vulnerable sectors? This question is just one of the many concerns that must be addressed. Children from vulnerable communities in the Philippines need access to a good education. They also need help finding possibilities for distance learning. According to UNESCO [2], school closures affect around 28 million students; unfortunately, without the assistance of government and non-government groups, the COVID-19 pandemic indeed has had a significant impact on their learning quality.

Despite all these circumstances, the Department of Education (DepEd) is aggressively responding to social changes by offering various school curricula via online classes and investigating creative ways to the fourth industrial revolution. Much research conducted before

COVID-19 investigated the prospect of online classrooms as part of future education.

The increasing challenges in MAPEH teaching caught the bulk of our MAPEH teachers on guard during these uncertain times, and they were unprepared to change from traditional schooling to online education and other platforms. The nature of teaching MAPEH, especially in teaching sports, games, dances, and other physical activities, necessitates face-to-face delivery. Physical education is distinct from other academic subjects since it emphasizes more on physical activity engagement as a barometer for a child's performance. The absence of physical contact also inhibits students' ability to experiment with and discover new movement possibilities while participating in various physical activities. Thus, online instruction in physical education would require much preparation to transmit the values and practice of physical education successfully. Several theoretical models and approaches may be considered in the discourse relative to their preference for teaching styles and learning delivery modalities, which can contribute to making online classes equivalent to face-to-face courses about pedagogical effectiveness. For instance, Wang et al. [5] provided a comprehensive overview of two theoretical framework models for blended learning in design and implementation. These models are the Complex Adaptive Blended Learning Systems (CABLS) framework and Community of Inquiry (CoI). CABLS includes six system elements: the learner, the teacher, the technology, the content, the learning support, and the institution. In the system approach, all newbie teachers in blended learning can engage in key interacting components of content, learners, and technology. Whereas CoI, a model of inquiry-based teaching and learning in online or blended learning, is based on the work of John Dewey and constructive views of experiential learning. These two theoretical frameworks were applicable in any education segment, with appropriate adjustments based on the learner's need and characteristics, whether you are a teacher or instructor in K to 12 schools, colleges, and universities.

The field of education must be explored since most of the theories developed about distance learning are based mainly on informal guesses and speculation [6]. Due to the evolution of technology over the past 100 years, distance education has changed dramatically; this has created the need for new theories to guide the practice of distance education [7]Dr. Michael Simonson stated, "Initial thought for distance learning is that you can use a videotape, make a CD, video, or stream that video.

Then students will have a similar experience. But it is impossible for the learning to be identical [6].

Along this line, equivalency theory states that for distance education to be successful, it should be based on the idea of equivalency. Equivalency means that the more equivalent the learning experiences are for the distant and local learners, the more they match will be the outcomes of the learning activity. However, equivalency does not mean similar learning experiences are not identical, but various learning experiences can be considered equivalent if they produce equivalent learning [8]. The key to the theory is not to expect each learner to be taught and learn in the same way. Simonson [9] describes three keys to this theory: 1. Local and distant learners have fundamentally different environments, 2. Learning experiences have anything that happens to or with the student that promotes learning, including what is observed 3. Telecommunication systems are used synchronously and asynchronously.

Grounding our practice, in theory, could help us make better decisions when implementing blended learning and support our learners more effectively to achieve deep and meaningful learning. As most of us worldwide have done most of our learning in person and in classrooms, we usually refer to in-person and online teaching as a particular form of learning in person and school. Blended learning "is part of the ongoing convergence of two archetypal learning environments" [10]. However, the influence of the two types of delivery is different, and how to blend looks different if you are starting from an in-person school to how it looks if you are coming from a distance education background.

Based on the premise presented above, the gap lies in the teaching styles and learning modalities and the underlying reasons that have perhaps influenced teachers 'decisions and preferences. As such, the teaching-learning quality is maintained to achieve the essential learning competencies expected of every student. Thus, blended learning was mainly adapted to delivering instruction and modular distance learning to ease the global dysfunction in education.

In addition, the study has also sought to explore other options relative to teaching-learning engagement and how ready are both the teachers and students for such change in the teaching landscape. Now that we are in the post-pandemic, will these changes continue? What additional adjustments or teaching innovations most likely were added? These areas of concern were also explored and addressed.

Relative to the primary concerns, this academic investigation on MAPEH instruction during this challenging time is timely and significantly relevant.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study intends to determine the demographic profile of MAPEH teachers in various grade levels and subjects taught. Underscore the preferred teaching styles and learning delivery modalities among MAPEH teachers across multiple grade levels. It also aims to explore and establish other relevant factors that have influenced teaching styles in determining the learning delivery modalities used.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Research Design

The study utilized mixed-method research; according to Fraenkel et al. ￼11￼, this research design combines quantitative and qualitative methods. In this research, the quantitative aspect delves into determining the preferred teaching styles and learning delivery modalities among teachers; on the other hand, the qualitative element deals with the influence of the teaching styles on the LDM of the teachers.

Participants of the Study

The study participants were the MAPEH teachers of the 2nd Congressional District of Negros Occidental. A total population of 135 teachers was the actual respondents to the study comprised teachers in the Cities of Sagay and Cadiz, with 68 and 57 respondents, respectively, and the Municipality of Manapla, with ten respondents.

Research Instrument

The research instrument utilized in this study was a self-made questionnaire consisting of two parts. Part I deals with the profile of the participants in terms of the grade level and subject taught. It has two sub-sections labeled Part I-A and Part I-B. The most common teaching styles were described in Part I-A, whereas different learning delivery modalities were discussed in Parts I-B. Part II of the questionnaire solicited the MAPEH teacher's various teaching styles and learning delivery modalities used during the pandemic. Each respondent has five different teaching styles and six learning delivery modalities in each learning area in MAPEH from grades seven to ten.

Since the research instrument is a self-made questionnaire, the researcher has established its validity and reliability. In the conduct of validity, the researcher asked five experts in physical education to validate the self-made questionnaire. The validity index was 4.71, using the validity tool developed by Good and Scates. In this regard, the research instrument is valid to a very high degree. Using the interrater reliability technique, the percent of agreement between two raters was a reliability index of 0.91. It means that the self-made questionnaire is reliable to a very high degree.

Data Gathering and Analysis

The following are the different phases of data gathering and analysis:

Phase 1 Preparation of Research Instrument

In the research instrument, the researcher initially randomly surveyed other Junior MAPEH teachers teaching grades seven to ten in the public schools from other city divisions in the province. The survey questionnaire elicited the teaching styles used and their preferred teaching delivery modalities identified by the DepEd. The developed research instrument was presented to five specialists in Physical Education (PE) and research for validation, including the non-structured interview guide questions focusing on the influence of teaching styles on LDM, which were used for focused group discussion or FGD.

Phase 2 The Conduct of the Research Instrument to the Target Participants and Ethical Considerations

The second phase included the preparation of communication seeking permission for the conduct of the study. Administration and retrieval of the research instruments followed. In the FGD, the researcher selected two teacher-participants from each LGU based on their experienced and length of service as MAPEH teachers.

Further, in compliance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, all information gathered in this study was treated with the utmost confidentiality. Part of the instrument also indicates the participants' consent to participate in the study. This consent form is consistent with the objectives of the study.

The findings of the study were provided to the participants for them to reflect on any future research endeavor. Like in any research undertaking, honesty is one of the researchers' primary concerns regarding the data and results by ensuring that no willful omission of any significant findings or manipulation to favor a specific interest was made. The researcher also recognized legality issues and thus observed ethics for publication and the like. And finally, the "Conflict of

Interest Statement" was also declared or included at the end of the manuscript.

Phase 3 Statistical Data Analysis

This phase deals with the analysis of the data using appropriate statistical tools. This study used frequency and percentages to determine the demographic profiles, preferred teaching styles, and learning delivery modes. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the number of observations for each possible variable value [12]. On the other hand, coding and thematic analysis were employed to analyze qualitative responses on the influence of teaching styles against learning delivery mode.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study sets out to investigate the preferred Teaching Styles and LDM among Junior MAPEH teachers in addressing the demands of the pandemic as part of the continuing learning plan. The following presentation of the results focused on identifying the demographic profile of MAPEH teachers across all levels and, likewise, determined their teaching styles and LDM that were used during these critical and challenging times. In the later part of this presentation, teachers' teaching styles influenced in determining their preferred modalities were also discussed comprehensively.

Demographic Profile

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of MAPEH Teacher-Respondents in Various Grade Levels and Subject Areas

Year Level	Music		Arts		PE		Health	
	f	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Gr. 7	48	25.95	48	25.95	48	25.95	48	25.95
Gr. 8	46	24.86	46	24.86	46	24.86	46	24.86
Gr. 9	49	26.47	49	26.47	49	26.47	49	26.47
Gr.10	42	22.7	42	22.7	42	22.7	42	22.7
Total	185	100	185	100	185	100	187	100

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution of 135 teacher respondents demographics coming from the second congressional district of the province of Negros Occidental. The demographic profile shows the number of respondents from various grade levels and different areas, such as MAPEH. Generally, the number of teachers teaching from other areas such as Music, Arts, and PE has a total of 185 teachers in each area and 187 teachers in health. Such a difference of 50 in the total number of teachers involved in this study compared to the total number of the population previously mentioned

is due to the multiple teaching assignments of some teachers teaching multi-grade levels across all areas in MAPEH. Thus, the number of teachers in each area did not match the total population of 135.

Specifically, for grade seven, there are 48 teachers (25.95%) in the areas of teaching MAPEH, with a total of 185 teachers. For grade eight, there are 46 teachers (24.86%) in the areas of teaching Music, Arts, and PE and 48 teachers of (25.95%). For grade nine, there are 49 teachers (26.47%) across all areas in MAPEH, and finally, for grade ten, there are around 42 teachers (22.7%) teaching across all areas in MAPEH. All 135

Teaching Styles

Table 2. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Teaching Styles among Grade 7 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	6.3	0	0.7	5.8
Demonstrator or Coach	15.1	9.4	11.1	12.5
Facilitator or Activity	18.8	26.6	20.1	25.5
Delegator or Group	13	14.6	17.4	11.5
Hybrid or Blended	46.9	49.5	50.7	44.8
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 2 shows that Hybrid styles are on top among the teaching styles that were utilized by teachers with the highest percentage share if compared to other teaching styles, which range from (44.8% to 50.7%) across all areas of MAPEH. On the contrary, the Presentation style is the least among the styles that were used in all areas in MAPEH, ranging from (0% to 6.3%). It can also be noticed that the facilitator style has the second-highest percentage in all areas of MAPEH if compared among the choices with percentage shares that range from (18.8% to 26.6 %). This style has a similar case to the other styles that were mentioned earlier. Demonstrator and Delegator styles shared the same spot when all styles were considered. This is so because the teaching Music and Health demonstrator style got the third-highest percentage share which ranges from (12.5% -to 15.1%) whereas the delegator and group style got the fourth-highest percentage which goes from (11.5 % to 13 %). On the other hand, the Delegator style, in teaching Arts and PE, has a percentage share that ranges from (14.6% to 17.4 %) which got the third-highest percentage, while the demonstrator style got the fourth-highest percentage share that ranges from (9.4 % to 11.1%,).

Table 3. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Teaching Styles among Grade 8 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	2.2	0	0	0
Demonstrator or Coach	26.7	13.6	16.7	15.1
Facilitator or Activity	29.4	34.3	21.7	32.3
Delegator or Group	10.9	12.5	15.9	7.8
Hybrid or Blended	31	39.7	45.7	44.8
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 3 reveals that Hybrid got the highest percentage shares ranging from 31% in Music to 45.7% in PE, among the teaching styles teachers used in teaching grade eight MAPEH. The facilitator or Activity style has the second-highest percentage share in the teaching of MAPEH, which ranges from 21.7 % for PE to 34.3% for Arts. Demonstrator style is also the third most preferred teaching style among grade eight MAPEH teachers in all subject areas, which ranges from 13.6% courtesy of Arts to 26.7% from Music. The fourth most preferred teaching style used is the Delegator style, with a percentage share of (7.8% to 15.9%) finally, the least used teaching style is the Presentation style, with a percentage share of (0 % to .2.2%).

Table 4. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Teaching Styles among Grade 9 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	11.7	6.1	4.8	12.3
Demonstrator or Coach	24	14.3	15	8.7
Facilitator or Activity	21.4	29.9	27.9	27.1
Delegator or Group	11.7	13.6	10.2	14.8
Hybrid or Blended	31.1	36	42.2	37.2
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 4 lets the reader identify the most and least minor preferred teaching styles among grade nine MAPEH teachers. First on the list is the Hybrid style which has a percentage share of (31.1% to 42.2%); this means that this style is the most frequently used by MAPEH teachers across all subject areas in grade nine. On the contrary, the Presentation style has a percentage share that ranges from (4.8 % to 12.3 %), which means that this is the minor style used in all subject areas except in Music, with has the same percentage share as the Delegator style (11. 7%). In the case of the Facilitator style, this style is the second most preferred style to use, as disclosed in its percentage share ranges from (27.1% to 29.9%) in all areas except in Music which is the third most preferred style to use, with a percentage share of (21.4%). Demonstrator style ranks 3rd in the areas of Arts

and PE with a percentage share of (14.3 % and 15%) respectively, while in health, it only placed fourth at (8.7%) and surprisingly in second with (24%) in Music. Delegator style ranks 4th in Arts and PE with a percentage share of (13.6% and 10.2 %), respectively, while it placed third in health with a (14.8 %) share. Interestingly, this style also marks the same percentage share of 11.7% Presentation style.

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Teaching Styles among Grade 10 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	6	0.8	0.8	4.8
Demonstrator or Coach	19.6	13.5	9.5	11.3
Facilitator or Activity	16.7	25.4	18.3	28.6
Delegator or Group	6.5	10.3	8.7	6.6
Hybrid or Blended	51.2	50	62.7	48.8
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 5 discloses the Hybrid style as the most preferred style in teaching used in all subject areas with a percentage share that ranges from (48.8%) mainly in health, too (62. 7 %) in PE. Delegator style got the second-highest percentage in Arts, PE, and Health which ranges from (18.3 % to 28.6 %); meanwhile, it has only (16.7 %) in teaching Music which is the third highest among the five styles. Demonstrator is the third most preferred style in teaching Arts, PE, and health, which ranges from (9.5% to 13.5%), while it placed second in Music with (19.6 %). Meanwhile, the Facilitator style placed fourth in all areas ranging from (6.5% to 10.3%), followed by the Presentation style, which ranked fifth in all areas ranging from (0.8% to 6%).

Learning Delivery Modalities

Table 6. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Learning Delivery Modalities among Grade 7 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	4.2	4.2	4.9	2.1
Demonstrator or Coach	56.8	55.8	54.9	52.1
Facilitator or Activity	15.1	17.2	13.2	19.8
Delegator or Group	0.5	1.6	2.1	2.1
Hybrid or Blended	23.4	21.3	24.3	24
Total	100	100	100	100

As reflected in Table 6, Modular Distance Learning got the highest percentage share (52.1 % to 56.8%) among the six LDM in all subject areas. In contrast, Home Schooling is the least preferred LDM with 0%, such as in Music, Arts, and Health, except in PE, with

0.7%. And Online Distance Learning has placed third with a percentage range (13.2 % to 19.8 %) among the six LDM in all subject areas. Additionally, Face-to-face, which ranges from 2.1% to 4.9%, placed fourth among the six LDM; however, it can be noted that it shared with TV/ Radio-Based Instruction in 4th place. And Blended Learning placed second with a percentage range of (21.3 % to 24.3 %) among the six LDM in all subject areas. Eventually, TV/ Radio-Based ranked fifth with a percentage share (0.5% to 2.1 %) among the six LDM in Music, Arts, and PE only. At the same time, it placed fourth alongside Face-to-face.

Table 7. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Learning Delivery Modalities among Grade 8 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	2.2	2.2	2.2	0
Demonstrator or Coach	72.3	67.4	70.3	62.5
Facilitator or Activity	9.3	13	13	18.8
Delegator or Group	1.7	3.8	0	0
Hybrid or Blended	14.7	13.6	13.7	18.8
Total	100	100	100	100

As reflected in Table 7, Modular Distance Learning got the highest percentage rate in all subject areas ranging from 62.5% to 72.3 % among the six LDM. While Blended Learning placed second in all subject areas ranging from 13.6% to 18.8% among the six LDM. Online Distance Learning placed third in all subject areas with a percentage share that ranges from 13.2 % to 19.8% among the six LDM, and Face-to-face placed fourth in all subject areas ranging from 2.1% to 4.8% among the six LDMs. TV/ Radio-based Instruction ranked fifth in all subject areas ranging from 0.5% to 2.1%, and Home Schooling placed sixth in all subjects ranging from 0% to 0.7% among the six LDM.

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Learning Delivery Modalities among Grade 9 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	4.1	4.1	4.1	2
Demonstrator or Coach	60.7	57.8	57.1	61.8
Facilitator or Activity	21.4	19.1	17.7	19.4
Delegator or Group	0	2.7	0	0
Hybrid or Blended	13.8	16.3	21.1	16.8
Total	100	100	100	100

As conveyed in Table 8, Modular Distance Learning got the highest percentage rate in all subject areas ranging from 57.1% to 60.7 %, among the six LDMs,

and Online Distance Learning placed second in Music, Arts, and Health with a percentage share that ranges from 19.1 % to 21.4%, while in teaching PE it placed third with a percentage share of 17.7% among the six LDM. Moreover, Blended learning placed third in Music, Arts, and Health, with a percentage share that ranges from 13.8% to 16.8%. While teaching PE, it ranked second with a percentage share of 21.1% among the sixth LDM. Coming in fourth is Face-to-face in all subject areas ranging from 2% to 4.1% among the six LDM. And finally, TV/ Radio-based Instruction placed fifth to sixth in all subject areas, which has the same 0% range as Home Schooling in Music, PE, and Health, whereas in Arts with 2.7% among the six LDM.

Table 9. Percentage Distribution of Preferred Learning Delivery Modalities among Grade 10 MAPEH Teacher-Respondents

Teaching Styles	Music	Arts	PE	Health
	%	%	%	%
Presentation or Lecture	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4
Demonstrator or Coach	50	54	51.6	52.4
Facilitator or Activity	14.9	14.3	9.5	7.1
Delegator or Group	0.6	0.8	0.8	0
Hybrid or Blended	32.2	28.6	35.7	38.1
Total	100	100	100	100

As manifested in Table 9, Modular Distance Learning got the highest percentage rate in all subject areas ranging from 50% to 54% among the six Learning Delivery Modalities, and Blended Learning placed second in all subject areas ranging from 28.6% to 38.1% among the six LDM. Coming in third place is Online Distance Learning in all subject areas, with a percentage share that ranges from 7.1% to 14.9% among the six Learning Delivery Modalities, and fourth with Face-to-face in all subject areas which has the same percentage range of 2.4% among the six LDM. Moreover, TV/ Radio-based Instruction placed five in Music, Arts, and PE, with a percentage share ranging from 0.6 to 0.8%; meanwhile, PE has a 0% share among the sixth LDM. And lastly, Home Schooling placed sixth in all subject areas with a 0% share among the six LDM.

Discussion

Teaching Styles

In Tables 2,3,4 and 5, teacher respondents' most popular teaching method was Hybrid or Blended. When asked why they prefer Hybrid or blended learning, most teacher-respondents would say the same thing; Considering the diversity of their student's learning styles and the nature of the subject/s that they are teaching, they believed that there is a need to reciprocate

these learning styles with their teaching styles and that the only way to respond to this scenario is to use Hybrid or blended learning. Given the limits imposed by online classes or other distance learning modalities, the utilization of this eclectic approach to teaching is also highly appropriate and timely. This narrative that the teacher-respondents mentioned above is similarly supported by the statements of:

Malvik [13] said that; we all have unique ways and varied experiences with the world, which eventually lead us to various ways to learn best. Thus, understanding and recognizing these differences impact how we handle our classes with our students and lead us to understand their differences. On the other hand, if we fail to do the same way of realizing things, then we might leave some of our students from learning in our class.

As an educator, we must make necessary adjustments to our lessons for any group of students if we feel and see the need to do much at any given time. Best teachers can always bring out the best of each student's strengths by ensuring they can fully comprehend the complete information.

For instance, Tshabalala et al. [14] investigated the learning perceptions and underscored the various challenges experienced by faculty members relative to the use of a blended-based approach. Results revealed that blended-based instruction could improve teaching and learning flexibility, promote learning independence, increase network learning opportunities, and provide better access for teachers and students.

In addition, as highlighted in the CABLS framework, content is one of the six elements that was given due consideration. Content or the subject matter is still a significant influence on the delivery of learning because its material elements are used to engage learners in mastering the subject. The interactive, dynamic, media-rich online materials create opportunities for teachers and learners to add content before, during, and even after the course experience—the dynamics between the learner, the teacher, and technology.

After hybrid or mixed, the facilitator or activity comes next. This style is also the second most widely used and recommended by most MAPEH teachers across all subject areas and grade levels. Students are given an online exercise or something to complete, and then they are encouraged to ask rather than answer questions. This teaching style promotes self-learning and self-actualization and improves critical thinking skills. According to the teacher-respondents, most of their instruction was activity-based for students to explore. Proof of the students is submitted through pictures or any printed copies attached to their module if the teacher prefers to use modular distance learning. Moreover, this style is predominantly used but not limited to the teaching of PE, where most of the deliverables involve physical engagement, like in the education of sports, games, dance, and exercises. Music also uses this teaching style by giving some music drills for students to rehearse, such as singing and other rhythmic activities.

The situation mentioned above is supported by the statement made by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) [15] states that teachers are more likely to consider students as active participants in the process of learning rather than seeing the teacher's primary function as information transmission and display of the "right solutions ."This is most true in northwest Europe, Scandinavia, Australia, and Korea, and it is least accurate in southern Europe, Brazil, and Malaysia, where teachers have two differing views. Teachers in all nations place a higher priority in the classroom on ensuring that learning is well structured than on student-centered activities that give them more autonomy. Both teaching methods are prioritized over enhanced learning activities like project work. Every country follows the same pattern.

The Demonstrator or Coach style is the third most popular among teacher respondents. It is like the lecture style but includes multimedia presentations, class activities, demonstrations, and spoken lectures. The teacher will usually do the actual implementation; however, most teachers will generate and prepare their own pre-recorded movies due to camera location requirements and space constraints. Others might use films made by other teachers or a video-sharing network like YouTube. The coaching technique is best for in-person or face-to-face training, but it may also be done through online coaching, where students perform movement skills such as in sports and dancing, and the teacher provides comments after each performance. Others, however, due to unpredictable internet connectivity, choose to complete or submit the prepared video performance before the start of the class, and this will be shown to the class for comments and ideas during the synchronous session. Peer evaluation is even encouraged. While the method is appropriate for face-to-face and online classrooms, it has a disadvantage when the teacher's learning delivery mode is modular remote learning.

The Delegator or Group style is the fourth favored style. This style is identical to the activity style, except that this time the activity is assigned to a group of students to do while adhering to the minimal health

regimen. The group members outsourced the job to stimulate peer collaboration and student-to-student learning. This is the best style for lab activities and peer input. In teaching MAPEH, this style is often explored by schools located in far-flung areas with zero cases of covid as per Inter-Agency Task Force guidelines, so in this case, students are allowed to go out of their homes. In this case, students can work on the activity with other family siblings or relatives. In addition, they can also work with their classmates who are living nearby.

Finally, is the presentation or lecture style. This style is the fifth or the least preferred style used by teacher-respondents. In this style, the teacher usually talks during the discussion. Students sit down with their computers or cellphones and listen to the teacher; they also take down notes of what is being said by the teacher. In most cases, the teacher will present their PowerPoint Presentation and incorporate visual images, GIFs, videos, etcetera. Based on how this teaching style is conducted, it may not work well if delivered through a module. However, this style may work better using other learning delivery modalities, particularly the integration of face-to-face delivery.

Additionally, Gill [16] also cited that; one of the advantages of this style is that it is acceptable for specific higher-education disciplines and auditorium settings with large groups of students. The pure lecture style is most suitable for subjects like history, necessitating memorizing key facts, dates, names, etcetera. On the contrary, it is a questionable model for teaching children because there needs to be more interaction with the teacher. Plus, it can get a little snooze-y. It is a better approach for older, more mature students.

Learning Delivery Modalities

Modular Distance Learning (MDL) is the most favored learning delivery option among the teacher-respondents in this study, as shown in Tables 6,7,8 and 9. Individualized education is used in this method, which allows students to employ SLM in paper or digital format. Most teachers regard the usage of MDL as the most viable option among the several possibilities provided to them at the start of the deployment of remote learning. They only need a computer with a printer, enough printer ink, and bond papers to construct the module. However, the late arrival of the official soft copies of the module from the central office, even the time requirement, and the insufficiency of such supplies have later become a recurring problem for teachers. To other teachers, it is even worse because they need to purchase their printers to expedite production.

Moreover, according to DepEd [17], all electronic learning materials were made accessible to all learners on all their gadgets, may it be a personal computer, cellphone, or tablet. Other e-learning materials, offline e-books, all computer-based applications, and CDs, DVDs, and USB storage were also utilized. As to monitoring the student's progress, the teacher will take full responsibility; conversely, students may seek assistance from the concerned teacher online. If necessary, the teacher's home visits to the students' houses shall commence for remediation and other aid. Volunteerism is expected from any family member and other community stakeholders who serve as para-teachers.

Blended learning is the second most popular LDM. This learning approach refers to a combination of face-to-face and any or all forms of online remote learning. The type of face-to-face interaction that the teachers are referring to occurs during the module distribution because it is the only opportunity for them to see each other and address some of their students' concerns because they do not have any other means of doing or conducting follow-up with their students. "Aside from using MDL, they selected to employ another way of delivery, such as building a group chat through Facebook Messenger that acts as their platform for offering further training or other resource materials such as links for additional readings and related videos as reinforcement for their lesson in the module."

The third most popular LDM is Online Distance Learning (ODL), which uses various technologies accessed through the internet to engage learners actively, although they are geographically separated during teaching. This style can be applied synchronously or asynchronously. Despite the instructors' desire to engage in this particular manner, they needed to be improved by various restrictions. Some teachers must be fully prepared or familiar with online platforms, necessitating training. Even before the epidemic, the public school system lacked its own Learning Management System (LMS) that was widely available.

As a result, the majority chose to use Google Meet to conduct online classes; aside from being free of charge, it is also student- and teacher-friendly. Some professors are considering adopting Zoom, but due to limitations such as a high bandwidth need and a limited number of minutes per session allowed, many have resorted to using Google Meet. Another reason most teachers hesitate to use ODL is that most students need computers or cell phones. There is a connectivity issue, and even worse, no internet connection to make matters worse.

Even if the students have gadgets to help them join the online class, one primary concern their parents will have, is the additional expenses of their cellphone charges. The concern mentioned above increases the financial burden on the parents, who are still struggling due to the pandemic.

For example, Snelling & Fingal [4] have similar insights and advice about online learning: Equity is the biggest challenge in preparing for online education, and it should be the first thing you consider if your district is not1:1 and does not have devices to go home with everyone, conduct a survey ahead of time to determine who will require devices and bandwidth. Most households do not have a computer for each member. Parents may work from home during school closure, resulting in multiple individuals competing for one or two computers. As a result, they must ensure that all web apps are compatible with mobile devices if a laptop is unavailable.

Schools must determine how to buy or rent Wi-Fi hotspots for teachers and students with any available Wi-Fi connection and establish concrete plans for distributing both devices and hotspots. In cases of a power shutdown in any part of the city or municipality, students will most likely be absent, and the worst thing to happen is if the shutdown happens to the teacher conducting the class.

The fourth alternative is Face-to-Face LDM, which, while not recommended, is possible in some specific instances. Besides, this is the traditional method of delivering classes to students, in which both the students and the teachers are physically present. According to some teachers, some were sent to far-flung places with no incidents of covid, and a minimal number of community members even sought to meet in person with a couple of several students. Most teachers doing this do not have electricity or internet access at all, and teachers who are engaging in this type of delivery are also staying or living in that village; unfortunately, it was stopped after a few months when the module was made available to them.

DepEd [17] further said this is impossible in areas under the Moderate and High-risk severity grading. However, there are learners with disabilities whose conditions require face-to-face instruction. Such a condition is still the subject of further discussion within DepEd, with partners, and with parents. The face-to-face option is also feasible in very low-risk areas such as geographically isolated, disadvantaged, and conflict-affected areas with no history of infection and very low and easily monitored external contacts, but with teachers and learners living near the school. Any face-to-face learning delivery must have proper risk assessment and adhere to the health protocols. Learning spaces near the school may add more areas for the conduct of classes with the appropriate social distancing.

TV/Radio-Based Instruction usage ranks fifth on the list of recommended LDM. SLMs are transformed into video lessons for television-based training, and for radio-based instruction, SLMs are converted into radio scripts. According to the study's teacher-respondents, this delivery style is only employed as a supplemental source of information, serving as reinforcement for key module subjects. This LDM is very useful for students who need access to cellphones or internet connections in their area, other than television and radio.

Because this is a supplementary LDM, no one teacher in the province's second district has ever used it as the primary LDM; it is always used in conjunction with MDL or ODL. Critical for implementation will be the production of the needed teacher's and learner's learning materials and the support of media institutions like TV and radio station.

Finally, Home Schooling is an alternate delivery model that attempts to give learners a high-quality primary education delivered by qualified parents, guardians, or tutors in a home-based setting. This LDM was never introduced or used by any instructors in Negros Occidental's second congressional district. However, this scenario is only possible if the teacher is the student's parent or guardian. Students who can afford to pay personal tutors can do so at home in scarce situations, but this is not part of the DepEd homeschooling program.

This Alternative Delivery Model (ADM) aims to provide learners access to quality primary education through a home-based environment facilitated by qualified parents, guardians, or tutors who have undergone relevant training. It allows families to educate according to their faith, philosophy, and values and to adjust learning schedules around family schedules and circumstances. However, its implementation still needs to improve, including the supervision of licensed teachers and alignment with the curriculum. Thus, this modality will be the subject of a later DepEd issuance before its expansion.

The variety of LDM that were discussed above obviously has its unique features on how learning will be facilitated and transmitted to the learners by the teachers, but if closely analyzed, it is ultimately directed to one main goal, and that is to make its students learn the most to a variety of engagements regardless of their learning

spaces. Such learning deliveries can be closely associated with the CoI theoretical framework in blended learning which describes the necessary elements to create deep and meaningful understanding. The original framework identifies the education experience as occurring at the convergence of the three presences cognitive, teaching, and social. In applying this model, presence is defined as a state of mindful awareness, receptivity, and context of their learning environments [18].

In summary, it can be construed that both teaching styles and LDM used were grounded in the theory of constructivism according to Dyson et al., [19]which has three faces which include the " active learner," the "social learner," and the " creative learner ."Active learner" refers to students engaged in decision-making, questioning, discussion, and critical thinking throughout all lessons. Social Learners worked with a group during their collaborative work, may it be in video group dancing and playing where social interaction was evident even if it is online, and finally, Creative Learners since they participated in some activities that allowed them to be creative and imaginative.

The Influence of Teaching Styles in Determining Learning Delivery Modalities

Most teachers admitted that similar to the consideration they made in choosing their preferred teaching style; they also acknowledge that there are various ways identified one way or the other that influenced their learning delivery mode. Some of them mentioned the situation of their learners, and some would also consider specific challenges. They further explained that they are so eager to choose ODL mode, particularly in the teaching of PE and Music, because, in most cases, they need a specific demonstration of or perhaps send a short instructional video for their students to rightfully get the correct manner of execution of particular skills, in this case, the only way to it is thru ODL. As quoted by one female teacher," *as a young faculty member, I would love to use ODL, but, as I looked around, most of my co-teachers are already old, so I think this a big challenge among them."* Another male participant said, "*In choosing my teaching style to use, I did not only think of myself, but I am more bothered with my students' economic situation, so I just changed my choice* ."These responses are so sad that they cannot push for it because most students do not have the gadget or the means to engage, and some old-aged teachers who did not have the technical skill. In addition, this is a very precarious situation between the students and teachers due to minimal resources and time because of the financial or socio-economic status brought about by the pandemic.

In some cases, teachers would spend much time preparing visual illustrations or infographics as supplementary materials to the MDL to help students better understand and appreciate the lesson. Likewise, some teachers find the module vague and misleading for students to follow. According to Doyle [20], creating visual explanations improve learning, and the average person can recall 65% of visual information ten days later compared to 10% of what they just heard. Again, this scenario of making supplementary materials is time-consuming on the teachers' part. However, they do not have the choice; instead compel themselves to it because if they will rely on the module, most students respond differently or deviate from what is expected of them to do. Again this is a waste of time for both teachers and students because the teachers will require the students to make a necessary revision of their previous work, and besides, all teachers are desirous to maximize students' learning.

OECD [8]) agreed that teaching styles can vary from one instructor to another because they are heavily influenced by the teacher's characteristics, educational philosophy, life philosophy, and attitude. Teaching styles are formed by teaching preferences, appraisal of learning tools, classically acknowledged by the delivery of instruction, and augmentation of students' specific learning needs. In addition, Elkaseh [21] stated that teaching style is multifaceted and affects how teachers present material, handle classroom activities, engage with students, supervise coursework, mentor students, and connect with students in the field.

In addition, the pandemic has altered the educational setting; thus, new platforms require changing conditions, necessitating different approaches utilized when the curriculum was first established. Next, the knowledge and professional competencies needed to adopt new techniques which require training for both the teachers and the students [22].

Most teacher-respondents always way things among the many options available to them, like the teaching styles and learning delivery modalities, which they think serve best and benefit the students the most in terms of education and the context of the pandemic. Thus, it would require modification of the platform to be used in the new context and consider the basic knowledge or competencies required from a teacher or student who will be engaging specific methodologies they wish to work.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The need for teachers and students to adapt their teaching techniques or approaches and their delivery forms of instruction has been one of the direct repercussions of the pandemic. During this period, when the cumulative incidence of COVID-19 was extraordinarily high, teachers were compelled to engage in distant or blended education, and teachers had to respond swiftly to these shifts. This adaptation has significantly increased their expertise in effectively teaching their students, a fundamental change in the MAPEH teaching landscape in times of systemic global dysfunction.

Specifically, it is dominant among-teacher respondents to engage in a blended teaching approach as the most practical way of responding to various learning orientations of the learners. Likewise, in selecting their LDM, it is domineering that they used the MDL, teachers handling PE and music classes, particularly, need help to deliver to achieve the MELC. Teacher-respondents admittedly agreed that they must reinforce their MDL with ODL to compensate for those areas which MDL failed to address; however, it is also disheartening to note that not all would have an equal opportunity to engage online.

On this note, it is suggested that all concerned teachers, particularly education experts in the DepEd, must address the following concerns: First, teachers' teaching tactics and approaches must be consistent with the student's chosen learning styles and modalities. Second, rather than focusing just on the needs of visual learners, auditory and kinesthetic pupils must also be considered, particularly in PE and Music, which demand physical engagement. Teachers must also have various activities to cater to students' needs. Third, there should be justice and equity regarding interests, conditions, and degrees of talent, especially during the pandemic. As a result, creating relevant instructional materials is desirable, as students learn best when they see, hear, feel, or experience what they are studying. Finally, changes must be made to the themes included in the syllabus or the academic plans of the teachers, as agreed by the educational leaders. The contents or subjects should cover the core learning competencies while maintaining the content's instructional quality.

Similar research is encouraged to be replicated for future studies considering that this study is focused mainly on teaching-learning style and modality. In-depth analysis may be conducted for specific areas which remain unexplored, particularly in some far-flung regions in which, until now, connectedness is still a significant problem in terms of blended or hybrid learning. The same study may also be conducted and contextualized among private schools to find some parallelism in teachers' preferences among public school teachers, and in addition, students' preferences may be considered relative to teaching-learning engagement modalities. Interestingly, it is also very timely to investigate the effectiveness and usefulness of retaining some of the teaching-learning approaches and models being used, considering that we are now in the post-pandemic. Relative to this, Garrad & Page [23] said in their study on the continued relevance of connecting students that their learning results indicated that students found the most practical pedagogical approaches assisted with minimizing isolation. This unexpected finding arose from the changing context of the school's academic experience. Such experience is a manifestation of the learners gradually shifting gear in our approaches, considering now that we are in the post-pandemic time.

REFERENCES

[1] Ducharme, J. (2020). World Health Organization Declares COVID-19 a " Pandemic ."Time Magazine. https://time.com/5791661/who-coronavirus-pandemic-declaration/

[2] UNESCO's Support: Educational Response to COVID-19(2021) https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse/support

[3] Child Hope Philippines. Inc. (2021) Alternative Education Online Learning the New Normal https://childhope.org.ph/alternative-learning-online-education/

[4] Snelling, J. & Fingal, D. (2020). 10 Strategies for Online Learning During a Coronavirus Outbreak. https://www.iste.org/explore/learning-during-covid-19/10-strategies-online-learning-during-coronavirus-outbreak

[5] Wang, Yuping & Han, X. & Yang, Juan. (2015). Revisiting the Blended Learning Literature: Using a Complex Adaptive Systems Framework. Educational Technology and Society. 18. 380-393. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282686856_Revisiting_the_Blended_Learning_Literature_Using_a_Complex_Adaptive_Systems_Framework

[6] *Laureate*. (2019). Laureate. https://www.laureate.net/

[7] Simonson, M., Schlosser, C., & Hanson, D. (1999). Theory and distance education: A new discussion. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *13*(1), 60-75.

[8] Simonson, I. (2008). Will I like a "medium" pillow? Another look at constructed and inherent preferences. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *18*(3), 155-169.

[9] Simonson, M. (1999). Equivalency theory and distance education. *TechTrends*, *43*(5), 5-8.

[10] Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. Hofmann, J., (2006). Why Blended learning has yet to fulfill its promises. Handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs, 27-40.

[11] Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to design and evaluate research In education (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

[12] Turney, S. (2022, June 7). *Frequency Distribution | Tables, Types & Examples*. Scribbr. https://www.scribbr.com/statistics/frequency-distributions/

[13] Malvik, C. (2020). 4 Types of Learning: How to Accommodate a Diverse Group of Students. https://www.rasmussen.edu/degrees/education/blog/types-of-learning-styles/

[14] Tshabalala, M., Ndeya-Ndereya, C. & van der Merwe, T. (2014). Implementing Blended Learning at a Developing University: Obstacles in the Way. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 12*(1), 101-110. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/153387/

[15] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2021). Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments: First Results from TALIS – ISBN 978-92-64-05605-3 https://www.oecd.org/berlin/43541655.pdf

[16] Gill, E. (2020). What is Your Teaching Style? 5 Effective Teaching Methods for Your Classroom. https://resilienteducator.com/classroom-resources/5-types-of-classroom-teaching-styles/

[17] DepEd (2020). Learning Opportunities Shall be Available. The Basic Education Learning Continuity Plan in Time of COVID-19. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/DepEd_LCP_July3.pdf

[18] Rodgers, C. R., & Raider-Roth, M. B. (2006). Presence in teaching. Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice, 12(3), 265-287.

[19] Dyson, B., Griffin, L. L., & Hastie, P. (2004). Sport education, tactical games, and cooperative learning: Theoretical and pedagogical considerations. Quest, 56(2), 226-240.

[20] Doyle, L (2019). Why are Infographics Effective in the Classroom? https://www.easel.ly/blog/infographics-effective-classroom/

[21] Elkaseh, A.,Wong, A. E. K.W. & Fung C. C. (2014). The Impact of Teaching and Learning Styles on Behavioral Intervention to use E-learning in Libyan Higher Education International Review of Contemporary Learning Research. http://dx.doi.org/10.12785/IRCLR/030103

[22] Verde, A. and Valero, J. M. (2021).Teaching and Learning Modalities in Higher Education During the Pandemic: Responses to Coronavirus Disease 2019 From Spain. Front. Psychol. 12:648592. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.64859

[23] Garrad, T. A., & Page, A. (2022, January). From Face-To-Face to the Online Space: The Continued Relevance of Connecting Students and Their Learning Post COVID-19. In Frontiers in Education (Vol. 7). Frontiers Media SA.