DETERMINANTS OF THE EFFICACY OF MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION IN THE SCHOOLS DIVISION OF OLONGAPO CITY

Michaela C. Madamecila

President Ramon Magsaysay Technological University, Iba, Zambales, Philippines

https://doi.org/10.54922/IJEHSS.2024.0863

ABSTRACT

The research study aimed to determine the determinants of efficacy of Mathematics instructions in the Schools Division of Olongapo City. The study made use of the descriptive method as the main instrument to gather necessary data. The descriptive method is use for the study that needs an interpretation and analysis of the gathered data to accomplish its objectives. The researcher utilized item analysis, the use of descriptive statistics for the frequency, percentage, rank and mean. Analysis of Variance and Pearson Correlation Coefficient to determine the determinants of efficacy of mathematics instruction. The study proves that there was a highly significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacherrespondent's length of service and there was a significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacher-respondents' sex, civil status, grade level taught, highest educational attainment and number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics. The researcher strongly recommended teachers to attend also in in-service trainings and workshop to improve their craft. Teacher should also pursue their graduate education to become more updated on the trend in education. Mathematics teachers shall possess gualities of an effective facilitator of learning, And, School administrator/teachers should provide textbooks, worksheets and other appropriate learner's material. Another similar study is hereby recommended to test the validity of the present study.

Keywords: Efficacy, Mathematics Instruction, Determinants, Descriptive Method.

1. INTRODUCTION

Mathematics is an extremely important subject of study. It plays an important role in forming the basis of all other sciences which deal with the material substance of space and time. Mathematics may be described as the fundamental science. It may be broadly described as the science of space, time and number. The universe exists in space and time, and its constituted of units of matter. To calculate the extension or composition of matter in space and time and to compute the units that make up the total mass of the material universe is the object of Mathematics. For the space-time quantum is everywhere full of matter and we have to know matter Mathematically in the first instance. Knowledge of Mathematics is absolutely necessary for the study of Physical Sciences, computation and calculation are the bases of all the studies that deal with matter in any form. Even the physician who has to study biological cells and bacilli need to have a knowledge of Mathematics, if he means to reduce the margin of error which alone can make his diagnosis dependable. To the mechanic and engineer it is a constant guide and help, and without exact knowledge of Mathematics, they cannot proceed one step in coming to grips with any complicated problem. Be it the airplane or the atomic bomb, radio communication or nuclear power, anything that has to do with anything concerning matter in any form, a knowledge of the

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

principles of Mathematics is the one thing absolutely necessary. Of course, it goes without saying that an elementary knowledge of the simplest branch of Mathematics, arithmetic is the daily requirement of every man and woman in the ordinary affairs of life. Mathematics has a most important bearing on the intellect as such. Study of Mathematics promotes habits of accuracy and exactitude, and prevents a man from being careless and slipshod. It sharpens the reasoning powers of a man and increase his mental alertness. On the whole, a mathematically minded man is usually more dependable than one who is otherwise disposed. That is why the study of some Mathematics is compulsory up to the secondary stage of all education systems, and its habit has to be sedulously fostered. In the modern age, the intensely abstract nature of pure Mathematics has brought the science nearer to philosophy. Knowledge of Mathematics is indispensable both for the man in the street as well as for scientist and philosophers. In the school curriculum, Mathematics is one of the vital subjects. Numeracy is quite needed by an individual for effective functioning in a day to day life. The child is considered to be able to relate to other people most effectively if he possesses the fundamental mastery of numbers and its operations. With such skills, his coping and learning capabilities are enhanced. The development of basic numeracy serves as the basic guidelines for Mathematics educators and teachers in undertaking projects that relate to curriculum development and evaluation.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study assessed the Mathematics instruction in the public elementary schools in the Schools Division of Olongapo City and the problem met by intermediate (Grade IV, V, VI) Mathematics teachers.

It will answer the following questions:

- 1. What is the professional background of the respondents in relation to the following profile variables:?
 - 1.1 Highest educational attainment;
 - 1.2 Length of service;
 - 1.3 Number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics;
 - 1.4 Designation
 - 1.5 Sex
 - 1.6 Civil Status
- 2. How do the respondents assess Mathematics instruction with respect to the following components?
 - 2.1 Qualities of Mathematics Teachers
 - 2.2 Learners' Study Skills
 - 2.3 Teaching Methods and Strategies
- 3. What are the problems encountered by the teachers in teaching Mathematics?
- 4. Is there a significant difference in the perception on the qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to the teacher's profile variables?
- 5. Is there a significant difference in the perception on the learners' study skills when grouped according to the teachers' profile variables?
- 6. Is there a significant difference in the perception on the teaching methods and strategies when grouped according to the teachers' profile variable?

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study made use of the descriptive method of research with the questionnaire as the primary instrument to gather the needed data. This method is the most appropriate in assessing Mathematics instruction in Schools Division of Olongapo City. Descriptive research method used to describe the nature of situation as it exists at the time to study, and to explore the courses of a particular phenomenon. The descriptive method as an activity involves collection of data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the research. A descriptive study determines and reports the way things are. The study was conducted at the selected public elementary schools and the respondents were seventy-three (73) in Schools Division of Olongapo City.

The researcher made use of the survey questionnaire to gather data. The questionnaire was composed of three (3) parts. The first part dealt with profile of respondents those that pertain to the highest educational attainment, length of service, number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics, designation, sex and civil status. Part II composed of reference to the essentials of Mathematics instruction such as qualities of the Mathematics Teachers, learner's study skills and instructional methods strategies and the third part includes a list of the problem encountered by teachers in teaching Mathematics.

The researcher secured permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Olongapo City by a way of a letter request duly endorsed by the Dean of the Graduate School, President Ramon Magsaysay Technological University, Iba, Zambales. After the approval of the authorities, the questionnaires were distributed to the target respondents.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

| No. | School | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | Asinan Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 2 | Balic-Balic Elementary School | 5 | 7 |
| 3 | Banicain Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | Baretto II Elementary School | 5 | 7 |
| 5 | Barretto I Elementary School | 5 | 7 |
| 6 | East Bajac-Bajac Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 7 | Gordon Heights I Elementary School | 6 | 8 |
| 8 | Gordon Heights II Elementary School | 5 | 7 |
| 9 | Ilalim Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 10 | Iram Elementary School | 2 | 3 |
| 11 | James L. Gordon Integrated School | 3 | 4 |
| 12 | Kalalake Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 13 | Mabayuan Elementary School | 4 | 6 |
| 14 | Nellie E. Brown Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 15 | New Cabalan Elementary School | 3 | 4 |

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents by School

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| 16 | Old Cabalan Integrated School | 2 | 3 |
|----|--|----|-----|
| 17 | Olongapo City Elementary School | 2 | 4 |
| 18 | Sergia Soriano Esteban Integrated School of Kalaklan | 3 | 4 |
| 19 | Sta. Rita Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 20 | Tabacuhan Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| 21 | Tapinac Elementary School | 3 | 4 |
| | Total: | 73 | 100 |

Table 2. Distribution of the Demographic Profile of Mathematics Teachers

| Demographic Profile | | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Sex | Male | 51 | 69.90 |
| | Female | 22 | 30.10 |
| | Total | 73 | 100.00 |
| Civil Status | Single | 17 | 23.30 |
| | Married | 55 | 75.30 |
| | Widowed | 1 | 1.40 |
| | Total | 73 | 100.00 |
| Grade Level Taught | Grade IV | 26 | 35.60 |
| | Grade V | 22 | 30.10 |
| | Grade VI | 25 | 34.30 |
| | Total | 73 | 100.00 |
| Length of Service | 1-9 | 24 | 32.90 |
| (Years) | 10-19 | 22 | 30.10 |
| | 20-29 | 19 | 26.00 |
| | 30 and above | 8 | 11.00 |
| Mean $= 16.17$ years | Total: | 73 | 100.00 |
| Designation | Teacher I | 33 | 45.20 |
| | Teacher II | 23 | 31.50 |
| | Teacher III | 6 | 8.20 |
| | Master Teacher I | 10 | 13.70 |
| | Master Teacher II | 1 | 1.40 |
| | Total | 73 | 100.00 |
| Highest Educational | BSEEd/ BEED | 41 | 56.16 |
| Attainment | BSEd Math | 2 | 2.74 |
| | BSEd General Math | 1 | 1.37 |
| | BSEEd/BEED with | 14 | 19.18 |
| | Masters Units | | |
| | BSEEd/BEEd with | 1 | 1.37 |
| | Doctorate Units | | |
| | MAEd | 13 | 17.81 |
| | MPA | 1 | 1.37 |

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| | Total | 73 | 100.00 |
|--------------------|-------|----|--------|
| Number of Training | 0-4 | 47 | 64.40 |
| Attended for | 5-9 | 18 | 24.70 |
| Mathematics | 10-14 | 6 | 8.20 |
| | 15-20 | 2 | 2.70 |
| | Total | 73 | 100.00 |

From a total of 73 respondents, there were more female (51 or 69.90%) than male (22 or 30.10%) teachers. There were 55 (or 75.30%) who are married compared to 1 (or 1.40%) who is widowed. There were 26 (0r 35.60%) teachers who teach Grade 4 compared to 22 (or 30.10%) who teach Grade 5 learners. The length of service of 24 (or 32.90%) teachers is from 1-9 years while 8 (or 11.00%) have served more than 30 years with a mean of 16.17 years.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the teachers' the designation, highest educational attainment, and the number of trainings attended for Mathematics.

The designation of 33 (or45.20%) is a Teacher I compared to 1 (or 1.40%) Master Teacher II. The highest educational attainment of 41 (or 56.16%) is BSEEd/BEED; 14 (or 19.18%) are graduates of BSEEd/BEED with Master's units, 13 (or 17.81%) are holders of MAED degree. There were 0-4 training courses attended by 47 (or 64.40%) teachers, while 2 (or 2.70%) attended 15-20 training courses in Mathematics.

| Qualities of Mathematics Teachers | Weighted Mean | Qualitative Interpretation | Rank |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------|------|
| 1. Provides opportunities to develop a sustain learners' interest in Mathematics. | nd 4.45 | Always | 3 |
| 2. Facilitates suitable learning experiences f the development of desirable attitud towards Mathematics. | | Always | 6 |
| 3. Motivates learners to participate actively Mathematical games and competitions the classroom. | | Always | 2 |
| 4. Utilizes available materials in teaching Mathematics. | ng 4.33 | Always | 5 |
| 5. Radiates enthusiasm and promot creativity. | es 4.23 | Always | 7 |
| 6. Exercises patience and self-control maintaining class discipline. | in 4.40 | Always | 4 |
| 7. Conducts action research for improveme of instruction. | nt 2.90 | Sometimes | 10 |

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| 8. Attends relevant in-service training activities to improve instructional skills and competencies. | 3.89 | Often | 9 |
|---|------|--------|---|
| 9. Employs a variety of instructional methodologies, strategies and techniques to facilitate the teaching and learning process. | 4.15 | Often | 8 |
| 10. Makes fair evaluation of learners' progress in Mathematics. | 4.59 | Always | 1 |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 4.18 | Often | |

The teacher-respondents perceived that the Mathematics Teacher Always "10 makes fair evaluation of learners' progress in Mathematics (with a rating of 4.59, rank 1), but Sometimes "7. Conduct action research for improvement instruction" (with a rating of 2.90, rank 10). Overall, it was perceived that Mathematics instruction could often be assessed in terms of qualities of a Mathematics teacher, with a mean rating of 4.18.

Table 4. Perceptions of Learners' Study Skills

| Learners' Study Skills | Weighted Mean | Qualitative Interpretation | Rank |
|--|------------------|-------------------------------|------|
| 1. Accomplish homework and daily assignments. | 4.23 | Always | 1 |
| 2. Review lessons during free times. | 3.85 | Often | 8 |
| 3. Take notes from teachers discussion. | 3.75 | Often | 9 |
| 4. Instruction given by the teacher are clearly understood and followed. | 4.11 | Often | 2 |
| 5. Submit complete and organized assignments. | 3.86 | Often | 7 |
| 6. Perform assigned classroom tasks/duties before playing or watching TV. | 3.62 | Often | 10 |
| 7. Attentively listen to the teacher while explaining or presenting the lessons. | 3.95 | Often | 4 |
| 8. Show interest in doing Mathematics activities. | 4.05 | Often | 3 |
| 9. Clarify lessons or tasks that are not understood. | 3.92 | Often | 6 |
| 10. Accomplish assignments with the help of parents, siblings and classmates. | 3.93 | Often | 5 |
| Over-all Weighted Mean | 3.93 | Often | |

Assessment of Mathematics instruction in terms of learners' study skills as perceived by the teacher-respondents is shown in Table 5. Among the study skills, the Mathematics teachers perceived that the learners Always "1. Accomplish homework and daily assignments" (with a

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

rating of 4.23, rank 1) However, it was perceived that the learners Often "6. Perform assigned classroom task/duties before playing or watching TV" (with a rating of 3.62, rank 10).

Overall, it was perceived that Mathematics instruction could Often be assessed in terms of the learners' study skills, with a mean rating of 3.93

| Teaching Methods and Strategies | Weighted Mean | Qualitative Interpretation | Rank |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------|
| 1. Uses Discovery Approach, | 4.07 | Often | 5 |
| 2. Uses Problem-Solving Approach | 4.21 | Always | 3 |
| 3. Uses Lecture-Discussion Method | 3.99 | Often | 7.5 |
| 4. Uses Question and Answer Method | 4.15 | Often | 4 |
| 5. Uses Drill Method | 4.33 | Always | 1 |
| 6. Uses Cooperative Learning | 4.32 | Always | 2 |
| 7. Uses Inductive Method | 3.96 | Often | 9 |
| 8. Uses Deductive Method | 3.89 | Often | 10 |
| 9. Uses Collaborative Method | 4.03 | Often | 6 |
| 10.Uses Manipulative Method | 3.99 | Often | 7.5 |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 4.09 | Often | |

Table 5. Perceptions on the Teaching Methods and Strategies

The perceptions on the teaching methods and strategies as show in Table 5 were used in the Assessment of Mathematics instruction. The teacher-respondents perceived that the Mathematics Teacher Always"5. Uses Drill Method "(with a rating of 4.33, rank 1) and Often "8. Uses Deductive Method "(with a rating of 3.89, rank 10).

Overall it was perceived that the Mathematics instructions could Often be assessed in terms of the teaching methods and strategies, with a mean rating of 4.09.

| Table6. | Summary | of | Perceptions | on | the | Indicators | of | Assessment | of | Mathematics |
|-------------|---------|----|-------------|----|-----|------------|----|------------|----|-------------|
| Instruction | 1 | | | | | | | | | |

| Indicators of Assessment of Mathematics Instruction | Over-all Weighted Mean | Qualitative Description | Rank |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| Qualities of the Mathematics Teacher | 4.18 | Often | 1 |
| Learners' Study Skills | 3.93 | Often | 3 |
| Teaching Methods and Strategies | 4.09 | Often | 2 |
| Overall Mean | 4.07 | Often | |

The respondents perceived that among the indicators, the qualities of the Mathematics teacher (rank 1), teaching methods and strategies (rank 2) and the learners' study skills (rank 3) could Often be used to assess Mathematics instruction.

Table 7. Perceptions on the Problems Encountered by Teachers in Teaching Mathematics

Table 7 shows data on the perception on the problems encountered by teachers in teaching Mathematics.

| Problems Encountered by Teachers in | Weighted | Qualitative | Rank |
|---|----------|----------------|------|
| Teaching Mathematics | Mean | Interpretation | |
| 1. Teacher's lack of mastery of subject | 2.70 | Sometimes | 9 |
| content and methodology. | | | |
| 2. Insufficient time allotment. | 3.14 | Sometimes | 6 |
| 3. Insufficient workbook/worksheets. | 3.64 | Often | 1 |
| 4. Inadequate textbooks and references. | 3.27 | Sometimes | 5 |
| 5. Lack of comprehension among learners. | 3.59 | Often | 2 |
| 6. Lack of administrative support | 2.77 | Sometimes | 8 |
| (monitoring and supervision of | | | |
| instruction). | | | |
| 7. Non-mastery of four fundamental | 3.47 | Often | 3 |
| operations among learners. | | | |
| 8. Classroom not conducive to learning. | 2.40 | Seldom | 10 |
| 9. Inadequate instructional materials. | 2.85 | Sometimes | 7 |
| 10. Negative attitude of learners towards | 3.42 | Often | 4 |
| the subject. | | | |
| Overall Weighted Mean | 3.12 | Sometimes | |

The teacher-respondent perceived that "3. Insufficient workbook/worksheets was Often the problem encountered by teachers in teaching Mathematics (with a rating of 3.64, rank 1). It was perceived that "8. Classroom not conducive to learning" was Seldom the problem encountered by teachers in teaching Mathematics (with a rating of 2.40, rank 10). Overall, it was perceived that Mathematics Teachers Sometimes encountered problems, with a mean rating of 3.12.

Table 8. Difference in the Perceptions on the Qualities of the Mathematics Teachers When Grouped According to the Teachers' Demographic Variables

The data on the difference in the perception on the qualities of Mathematics teachers when grouped according to the teachers' demographic variables is shown in Table 8.

| Demographic | Sources of | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|-------------|------------|---------|----|--------|---------|-------|
| Variables | Variation | Squares | | Square | | |
| Sex | Between | 0.01 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.06 ns | 0.801 |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Within | 8.83 | 71 | 0.12 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| Civil Status | Between | 0.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.01 ns | 0.992 |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------|-------|
| Civil Status | | 0.00 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.01 IIS | 0.992 |
| | Groups Within | 8.83 | 70 | 0.13 | | |
| | Groups | 0.05 | 70 | 0.15 | | |
| | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |
| Grade Level | Between | 0.29 | 3 | 0.10 | 0.78 ns | 0.510 |
| Faught | Groups | 0.29 | 5 | 0.10 | 0.78 115 | 0.510 |
| | Within | 8.54 | 69 | 0.12 | | |
| | Groups | 0.54 | 0) | 0.12 | | |
| | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |
| Length of | Between | 1.65 | 3 | 0.55 | 5.27 ** | |
| Service | Groups | 1.05 | 5 | 0.55 | 5.27 | |
| | Within | 7.19 | 69 | 0.10 | | |
| | Groups | 7.17 | 07 | 0.10 | | |
| | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |
| Designation | Between | 1.34 | 4 | 0.34 | 3.04 * | 0.023 |
| Designation | Groups | 1.5 1 | | 0.51 | 5.01 | 0.025 |
| | Within | 7.49 | 68 | 0.11 | | |
| | Groups | /> | 00 | 0.11 | | |
| | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |
| Highest | Between | 0.57 | 6 | 0.10 | 0.76 ns | 0.601 |
| Educational | Groups | | | | | |
| Attainment | Within | 8.26 | 66 | 0.13 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |
| Number of | Between | 0.77 | 3 | 0.26 | 2.19 ns | 0.098 |
| Relevant | Groups | | | | | |
| Frainings | Within | 8.07 | 69 | 0.12 | | |
| Attended for | Groups | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Total | 8.83 | 72 | | | |
| ** Highly signifi | cant at the 0.0 | 01 alpha leve | el of signific | ance (Ho is r | ejected) | |
| *-Significant at tl | | | | | - | |
| ns-Not significan | | | , | - · · | | |

There was highly significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teacher when grouped according to the teacher-respondents' length of service (Sig = 0.002). The computed significance value (Sig) is less than 0.01 alpha level of significance. There was a significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to the teacher-respondents' designation (Sig = 0.023). The computed significance value (Sig.) is less than 0.05 alpha level of significance.

There was no significant difference in the perceived qualities of Mathematics teacher when grouped according to the teacher-respondents' sex (Sig = 0.801), civil status (Sig = 0.992), grade

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

level taught (Sig. = 0.510), highest educational attainment, and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics are greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance.

Table 9. Post Hoc Comparison of the Treatment Means of the Perceptions on the Qualities of the Mathematics Teacher Using Duncan's Multiple Range Test

With the highly significant difference obtained from the analysis of variance, Table 10 shows the post hoc comparison of the treatment means of the perceptions on the qualities of the Mathematics teacher for the variable length of service using the Duncan's multiple range test.

| Length of Service (Years) | Weighted Mean | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 30 and above | 4.35 | | | | | |
| 20-29 | 4.33 | | | | | |
| 10-19 | 3.97 | | | | | |
| 1-9 | 4.18 | | | | | |
| Means followed by the same letter are not sign | Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different | | | | | |

There was highly significant difference in the weighted mean rating on the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teacher when grouped according to the respondent's length of service. The respondents whose length of service ranged from 20-29 and 30 and above, gave significantly higher mean ratings of 4.35 and 4.33 respectively compared to 3.97 given by the teachers who have served from 10-19 years.

Table 10. Difference in the Perception on the Learners' Study Skills When Grouped According to Teachers' Demographic Profile

The data on the difference in the perception of learners' study skills when grouped according to the teachers' demographic variable is shown in Table 10.

There was no significant difference in the perceived learners' study skills when grouped according to the teacher-respondents' sex (Sig. = 0.422), civil status (Sig. = 0.095), grade level taught (Sig. = 0.672), length of service (Sig. = 0.442), designation (Sig. = 0.213), and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics (Sig. = 0.236). The computed significance values (Sig.) for sex, civil status, grade level taught, length of service, designation and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics are greater than 0.05 alpha level of significance.

| Demographic Variables | Sources of Variation | Sum of Square | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----|----------------|---------|-------|
| Sex | Between | 0.21 | 1 | 0.21 | 0.65 ns | 0.422 |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Within | 22.92 | 91 | 0.32 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 23.13 | 72 | 0.75 | | |
| Civil Status | Between | 1.56 | 2 | 0.75 | 2.44 ns | 0.095 |
| | Groups | | | | | |

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| | 337'41 ' | 21.62 | 70 | 0.21 | , | , |
|---|----------|--------|--------------|----------------|---------|-------|
| | Within | 21.62 | 70 | 0.31 | | |
| | Groups | 22.12 | | | | |
| | Total | 23.13 | 72 | | | |
| Grade Level | Between | 0.26 | 2 | 0.13 | 0.40 ns | 0.672 |
| Taught | Groups | | | | | |
| | Within | 22.86 | 70 | 0.33 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 23.13 | 72 | | | |
| Length of | Between | 0.88 | 3 | 0.29 | 0.91 ns | 0.442 |
| Service | Groups | | | | | |
| | Within | 22.25 | 69 | 0.32 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 23.13 | 72 | | | |
| Designation | Between | 1.87 | 4 | 0.47 | 1.50 ns | 0.213 |
| - | Groups | | | | | |
| | Within | 21.25 | 68 | 0.31 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 23.13 | 72 | | | |
| Highest | Between | 4.72 | 6 | 0.79 | 2.82 ** | 0.017 |
| Educational | Groups | | | | | |
| Attainment | Within | 18.430 | 66 | 0.28 | | |
| | Groups | | | | | |
| | Total | 23.13 | 72 | | | |
| Number of | Between | 1.37 | 3 | 0.46 | 1.45 ns | 0.236 |
| Relevant | Groups | | | | | |
| Trainings | Within | 21.755 | 69 | 0.32 | | |
| Attended for | Groups | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Total | 23.13 | 72 | | | |
| ** - Highly signi ns – Not significa | | | of significa | ince (Ho is re | jected) | |

There was a significant difference in the perceived learners' study skills when grouped according to the teacher-respondents' highest educational attainment (Sig. = 0.017). The computed significance value (Sig.) is less than 0.05 alpha level of significance.

Table 11. Difference in the Perceptions on the Teaching Methods and Strategies When Grouped According to the Teachers' Demographic Variables

The data on the difference in the perceptions of teaching methods and strategies when grouped according to the teacher's demographic variable is shown in Table 11.

| Demographic Variables | Sources of Variation | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----|----------------|------|-------|
| Sex | Between Groups | 0.09 | 1 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.565 |

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| Civil Status Grade Level Taught Length of | Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total | 19.28 19.38 0.60 18.78 19.38 0.20 19.17 | 71 72 2 70 72 3 | 0.27 0.30 0.27 0.07 | 1.11 | 0.335 |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------|-------|
| Civil Status Grade Level Taught Length of | Between Groups Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total | 0.60 18.78 19.38 0.20 | 2 70 72 | 0.27 | | 0.335 |
| Grade Level Taught Length of | Within Groups Total Between Groups Within Groups Total | 18.78 19.38 0.20 | 70 72 | 0.27 | | 0.335 |
| Grade Level Taught Length of | Total Between Groups Within Groups Total | 19.38 0.20 | 72 | | | |
| Grade Level Taught Length of | Between Groups Within Groups Total | 0.20 | | 0.07 | | |
| Taught Length of | Within Groups Total | | 3 | 0.07 | | 1 |
| Length of | Total | 19.17 | | | 0.25 | 0.865 |
| Length of | Total | 19.17 | | | | |
| Length of | | | 69 | 0.28 | | |
| 0 | | 19.38 | 72 | | | |
| - | Between Groups | 1.93 | 3 | 0.64 | 2.54 | 0.064 |
| Service | | | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 17.81 | 68 | 0.26 | | |
| | Total | 19.38 | 72 | | | |
| Designation | Between Groups | 1.57 | 4 | 0.39 | 1.50 | 0.213 |
| | Within Groups | 17.81 | 68 | 0.26 | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Total | 19.38 | 72 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 0.83 | 6 | 0.14 | 0.50 | 0.810 |
| Educational | | | | | | |
| Attainment | | | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 18.54 | 66 | 0.28 | | |
| | Total | 19.38 | 72 | | | |
| Number of | Between Groups | 1.40 | 3 | 0.47 | 1.80 | 0.156 |
| Relevant | | | | | | |
| Trainings | | | | | | |
| Attended for | | | | | | |
| Mathematics | | | | | | |
| | Within Groups | 17.97 | 69 | 0.26 | | |
| | Total | 19.38 | 72 | | | |
| ns – Not significar | nt (Ho is accepted) | | | | | |

There was no significant difference in the perceived on the teaching methods and strategies when grouped according to the teacher-respondent's sex (Sig. = 0.565) civil status (Sig. = 0.335), grade level taught, (Sig. = 0.865), length of service (Sig. = 0.064), designation (Sig. = 0.214), highest educational attainment (Sig. = 0.510), and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics (Sig. = 0.516). The computed significance values (Sig.) for sex, civil status, grade level taught, length of service, designation. Highest educational attainment, and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics are greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance.

5. CONCLUSIONS

1. From 73 respondents, there 69.90% female than 30.10% male teachers. There were 55 who were married compared to 1 who is widowed. There were 26 who teach Grade 4 compared to 22 who teach Grade 5. The length of service of 24 teachers from 1-9 years while 8 have served more than 30 years. The designation of 33 teachers is Teacher I compared to 1

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

Master Teacher II. The highest educational attainment of 41 (or 56.16%) is BSEEd/BEED; 14 (or 19.18%) are graduates of BSEEd/BEED with Master's units, 13 (or 17.81%) are holders of MAED degree. There were 0-4 training courses attended by 47 (or 64.40%) teachers, while 2 (or 2.70%) attended 15-20 training courses in Mathematics.

- 2. In learners' study skills, the Mathematics teachers perceived that the learners, Always, accomplish daily homework and assignments however it was perceived that the learners, Often, performed assigned task/duties before playing/watching TV. In teaching Methods and Strategies, the teachers perceived that among the indicators, the qualities of Mathematics Teachers Always, uses Drill Method, and Often, uses Deductive Method. The respondents perceived that among the indicators, the qualities teachers (rank 1), teaching methods and strategies (rank 2) and learners' study skills (rank 3) could often be used to assess Mathematics instruction.
- 3. In problems encountered by teacher in teaching Mathematics, the teacher perceived that Insufficient workbooks/ worksheets was often the problem encountered by teachers in teaching Mathematics and classroom not conducive to learning was seldom problem encountered. Overall, it was perceived that Mathematics Teachers Sometimes encountered problems.
- 4. There was highly significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacher-respondents' length of service. There was also a significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacher-respondent designation. There was no significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacher-respondent designation. There was no significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacher-respondent designation. There was no significant difference in the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to teacher-respondents' sex, civil status, grade level taught, highest educational attainment and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics. Using Duncan's Multiple Range Test, there was a highly significant difference in the weighted mean rating on the perceived qualities of the Mathematics teachers when grouped according to respondents' length of service.
- 5. There was no significant difference in the perceived learners' study skills when grouped according to teacher-respondents' sex, civil status, grade level taught, and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics. But, there was a significant difference in the perceived learners' study skills when grouped according to teacher-respondents' highest educational attainment.
- 6. There was no significant difference on the teaching methods and strategies when grouped according to teacher-respondents' sex, civil status, grade level taught and the number of relevant trainings attended for Mathematics.

ISSN: 2582-0745 Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- **1.** Encourage learners to prioritize assignments or the school-related tasks before playing gadgets or watching TV.
- **2.** Employ varieties of Teaching Methods Strategies to motivate learners and ensure high interest of learning.
- **3.** Qualities of Mathematics teachers play an important role towards effective learning. They have to attend in-service trainings and workshops to improve their craft.
- **4.** School administrator/teacher should provide textbooks, worksheets and other appropriate learner's material.
- **5.** Teachers should continue their graduate education to become more updated on the trend in education.
- 6. Encourage learners to engage to some activities that boost their interest to learn Mathematics. There are ways to motivate children to love Math. Teachers may incorporate technology into the lessons. There are numerous Math applications on the market that provide students with challenging games. Another powerful trigger to cultivate love for Math is the teachers' enthusiasm in teaching.
- 7. Another study is highly recommended to test the validity of the study.

REFERENCES

Angeles, N. (2006) Cooperative Learning in teaching Mathematics: The Modern Teacher Vol, 55 No. 4 September

Bilbao, P (2006) The Teaching Profession, Q.C, Philippines: Lounar Publishing Co,. Inc

Marcella L., Ed.D (2006) Effective Mathematics Instruction Touro College Graduate School of Education Lander Center for Educational Research of Effective Mathematics Instruction

Bransford, Brown and Cocking (2000) <u>https://gse.touro.edu/media/schools-and</u> college graduate - school of education/eac/literature-reviews/BullmasterDayMathSynthesis

Cabarrubias, E. (2001) Factors Affecting Students' Performance in Mathematics IV in Zone III, Division of Zambales. Master's Thesis Columban College, Olongapo City

Carino, F. (2006). The Effectivelness of Small Group Cooperative Learning Strategy in teaching Elementary Mathematics, The Modern Teacher Vol 55 No 4

Castillo, F (2007) Research Education and Scientific Writing Manila Phils. : BookCare Publishing Corp

Corpuz, B (2006) Principles of Teaching 2, Qc, Phils: Lounar Publishing Co., Inc

Cross, C (2009) Mathematics Learning in Early Childhood: Paths toward Excellence and Equity, <u>https://eric.ed.gov</u>

Cruz, A. (2006) Mathematics Instruction in the Newly Nationalized High Schools in the Division of Zambales "Master's Thesis Columban College, Olongapo City

Flores, E (2001) "Problems Encountered by the Intermediate Mathematics Teachers in Sta. Maria, Bulacan "Master's Thesis. Polytecnic University of the Philippines"

Hirsch (2006) <u>https://gse</u>.touro.edu/media/schools-and-colleges/graduate-school-of-education/cac/literature-reviews/Bullmaster-DayMathSysnthesis

Meer S.H (2013) Seven Characteristics and Qualities of Good Teacher mathhttps://owlcation.com/academia/Characteristics-Of-A-Good-Teacher

ISSN: 2582-0745

Vol. 7, No. 06; 2024

| Mink, | Deborah | V | Ph.D | (2004)Strategies | | for | Teachir | ng | Mathematics |
|------------|---------------|--------|--------------|------------------|----|-----|---------|----|-------------|
| https://bo | ooks.google.c | comph/ | <u>books</u> | | | | | | |
| Norris(2 | 012) Mat | h] | Reports: | Mathematics | is | Im | portant | _ | Wordpress |

https://mathsreports.wordpress.com

Porkes (2012) Math Reports: Mathematics is Important

https://mathsreports.wordpress.com/over-all narrative/mathematics-is-important/

Salandaan G (2007) Elements of Good Teaching Manila, Phils : BookCare Publishing, Corp. San Miguel O. (1998) Problems Encountered and Solution in Teaching Elementary Mathematics. Master's Thesis Butanez University

Webster Active English Dictionary, New Delhi, India, Sterling Publishers Pvt Ltd (2009)

Srivastav (2013) Mathematics: Meaning, Importance and Uses

http//:www.importantindia.com/8083/Mathematics

Tanondong S (2006) Principles of teaching Mathematics: The Modern Teacher Vol.55 No.4

Young, E (1996). The Changing Mathematics Program for the Elementary Schools" A Report: Regional Conference in Mathematics for Schools Administrators. Manila

WEBLIOGRAPHY

https://www.manilatimes.bet/science-education-realities

https://www.teahchub.com/how-motivate-students-love

mathhttps://owlcation.com/academia/Characteristics-Of-A-Good-Teacher

https://www.educationcorner.com/habits-of-successful-students.html