



Received: 08/July/2025

IJRAW: 2025; 4(8):94-101

Accepted: 21/August/2025

## Teaching Practices of MAPEH and Non-MAPEH Majors in Selected Secondary Schools in the First District of Northern Samar

\*<sup>1</sup>Sheryll E Basiloy

\*<sup>1</sup>Instructor I, Department of Physical Education, College of Arts and Communication, University of Eastern Philippines, University Town, Catarman, Northern Samar, Philippines.

### Abstract

This study determined the teaching practices of Music, Arts, Physical Education, Health (MAPEH) majors and Non-MAPEH major teachers. It utilized a descriptive quantitative research. The respondents were 45 MAPEH majors and 59 non-MAPEH major teachers from 14 schools in the locale.

The profile of the respondents, MAPEH major teachers are generally younger, female, married, CAR recipient, in the entry level position, below ten years teaching experience, and attended seminars mostly on dance. For non-MAPEH major teachers, majority were female, married, MA graduate, teacher 3 position, specialized in values education, extensive teaching experience, with seminars in fitness exercises and first aid.

The teaching practices for both MAPEH majors non-MAPEH teachers were generally "Excellent" across all areas.

In terms of relationship of personal profile and teaching practices, age was significantly related to classroom instructional process, classroom management, and student evaluation. Sex was significantly related to classroom management and teaching strategies, while civil status was not significantly related to teaching practices.

**Keywords:** Teaching practices, classroom instructional process, classroom management, teaching strategies, and student evaluation.

### Introduction

Music, Arts, Physical Education, and Health (MAPEH) is a subject under MAKABAYAN curriculum in the Junior High School. It contributes to the improvement of students' cognitive skills, boosting self-confidence, developing creativity, promoting physical fitness, and enhancing social skills. MAPEH education faces numerous challenges. It often struggles with limited resource, lacks musical instruments, sports equipment, and art materials that can hinder the effective delivery of MAPEH lessons. In teaching this subject, many students may naturally excel in one area but struggle in another, making it essential for teachers to create an inclusive and supportive learning environment. Lessons should incorporate a mix of theory and practical activities, such as music performances, art projects, sports drills, and health-related discussions, to provide students with hands-on experiences.

It is practiced in the first district of Northern Samar that some non-MAPEH major teachers are assigned to teach MAPEH. The department head, as instructed and approved by the designate School Head or appointed principal, do so because of the unavailability of MAPEH major teachers. Some of these locally designated MAPEH teachers are either varsity athletes during college days, are sports-minded, or have been coaches or officiating officials during athletics competitions,

while some are plainly good at dancing and singing. And usually, those assigned to teach MAPEH are the newly hired teachers.

Out of fourteen schools from the different municipalities in the first district of Northern Samar, there are 45 MAPEH major teachers and 59 non MAPEH major teachers teaching MAPEH subject.

This study therefore, was conducted to determine the teaching practices of MAPEH major and non-MAPEH major teachers in public secondary schools in the first district of Northern Samar during the School Year 2024-2025.

### Objectives of the Study

This study generally aimed to determine the teaching practices and performance of MAPEH and non-MAPEH majors in public secondary schools in the first district of Northern Samar, during the school year 2024-2025.

Specifically, the study aimed to:

1. Determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:

#### i). Personal Profile

- a) Age,
- b) Sex,
- c) Civil Status;

## ii). Professional Profile

- Highest educational attainment,
  - Academic rank,
  - Field of specialization,
  - Length of teaching experience,
  - Kind/nature of trainings/seminars attended;
- Identify the teaching practices of MAPEH major and non-MAPEH major teachers in public secondary schools in the first district of northern Samar in terms of:
    - Classroom instructional process,
    - Classroom management,
    - Teaching strategies,
    - Student evaluation; and
  - Determine the significant relationship between the personal profile and the teaching practices of the respondents.

## Materials and Methods

This study was conducted in selected secondary schools in the first district of Northern Samar. The respondents were 45 MAPEH majors and 59 non-MAPEH major teachers from 14 schools in the locale. A complete enumeration of the target respondents was observed. All MAPEH major and non-MAPEH major teachers who teach MAPEH, as well as Department Heads, in selected public secondary schools were included in the study. However, for student-respondents, a simple random sampling was used using the sloven formula. This study used the descriptive correlational research design. The data gathered were treated statistically according to the objectives of the study. For the profile of the respondents, frequency counts, percentages, and weighted mean were used. To determine the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, Pearson Correlations was used.

## Results and Discussions

### Personal and Professional Profile

#### Age

The data revealed that 45 are MAPEH major, and 59 are Non-MAPEH major. Table 1.1a presents teacher-respondents personal profile in terms of age. The data shows that a substantial proportion of MAPEH major teachers are aged 30 and below (40.00%), followed by 31–40 (37.78%) age group. This indicates that most MAPEH educators are relatively young and likely in the early stages of their careers. The small percentages are in the older brackets 15.55% for ages 41–50 and 6.67% for 51 and above. This suggest either a steady influx of new graduates into the field or a higher turnover among older teachers.

In contrast, Non-MAPEH teachers are more concentrated in the 31–40 age range (47.46%), with substantial representation also in the 41–50 bracket (27.12%). Only 23.73% are aged 30 and below, and a minimal 1.69% are 51 or older. This distribution suggests a more mature and experienced teaching group among Non-MAPEH majors. Their longer tenure may provide greater stability within schools and position them as potential mentors or leaders. This is supported by the study of Lluz who found out that non-PEHM major teachers teaching PEHM subject were aged 31–35 years.

Likewise, these findings align with the results of Froilan's study, who observed that a considerable portion of teachers fall within the 25–34 age bracket. The age distribution in both MAPEH and Non-MAPEH groups confirms a diverse teaching workforce with varying levels of experience.

**Table 1.1(a):** Frequency Distribution of Personal Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age

Age	MAPEH Major		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
30 below	18	40.00	14	23.73	32	30.77
31 to 40	17	37.78	28	47.46	45	43.27
41 to 50	7	15.55	16	27.12	23	22.11
51 above	3	6.67	1	1.69	4	3.85
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

#### Sex

The data from Table 1.1b reveals a significant gender imbalance among MAPEH major teachers. Of the 45 respondents, 37 or 82.22% are female, while only 8 or 17.78% are male. This notable disparity suggests that MAPEH, as a field of specialization, is predominantly pursued by women. Such a trend may be influenced by societal expectations, cultural norms, or perceptions of MAPEH as a subject aligned with traditionally feminine roles. The overwhelming female representation may have implications for classroom dynamics, mentorship, and recruitment strategies in this area.

Among non-MAPEH major teachers, females also constitute the majority, accounting for 41 or 69.49%, with males comprising 18 or 30.51%. This indicates that the MAPEH junior high school teaching force in the first district of Northern Samar was female dominated. This may further suggest that the teaching of MAPEH subject is assigned mostly to female teachers.

These findings are consistent with existing literature, such as the study by Lluz which reported a high concentration of female teachers in the profession. Similarly, this finding support in Buedron's study which found out that majority of non-MAPEH teachers were female. This suggests that more women are drawn to teaching, especially for subjects like MAPEH.

**Table 1.1(b):** Frequency Distribution of Personal Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Sex

Sex	MAPEH Majors		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Male	8	17.78	18	30.51	26	25.00
Female	37	82.22	41	69.49	78	75.00
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

#### Civil Status

The data from Table 1.1c indicates that 27 or 60.00% of MAPEH major teachers are married, 18 or 40.00% are single. This distribution suggests that a substantial portion of the MAPEH teaching workforce is balancing both professional and familial responsibilities. The predominance of married individuals may influence their availability for after-school activities, weekend seminars, or extended training sessions—components often associated with MAPEH instruction, such as sports events or performances.

Among Non-MAPEH major teachers, 37 or 62.71% are married, 21 or 35.59% are single, and 1 or 1.69% are widowed. This slightly higher percentage of married educators mirrors the MAPEH group, suggesting similar personal dynamics across teaching departments. This infers

that a majority of the teachers had their family obligations and family-related responsibilities. This result is supported by the study of Buedron wherein majority of teacher respondents were married.

**Table 1.1(c):** Frequency Distribution of Personal Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Civil Status

Civil Status	MAPEH Majors		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Single	18	40.00	21	35.59	39	37.50
Married	27	60.00	37	62.71	64	61.54
Widow	0	0.00	1	1.69	1	0.96
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

### Respondent's Professional Profile

#### Highest Educational Attainment

Table 1.2a shows data on the respondent's professional profile in terms of educational attainment. From the table, it is evident that 19 or 42.22% of the respondents completed the academic requirements (CAR) for a master's degree, 9 or 20.00% have earned units toward a higher degree, tied at 8 or 17.78% have already completed a master's degree program and college graduate and 1 or 2.22% doctoral degree holder. This distribution suggests that MAPEH major teachers are not only committed to their profession but also in the process of advancing their academic qualifications.

In comparison, for Non-MAPEH major teachers 21 or 35.59% were MA degree holders, 17 or 28.81% had completed their academic requirements, 10 or 16.95% were college graduate, 8 or 13.56% were doctorate degree holders while 3 or 5.08% had masteral units. This means that the teachers still prioritize their professional growth they are not teaching their field of specialization.

This findings contradict the result of Buedron's study that says majority of non-MAPEH major teachers were bachelor's degree holder.

**Table 1.2(a):** Frequency Distribution of Professional Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Highest Educational Attainment

Highest Educational Attainment	MAPEH Majors		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
College Graduate	8	17.78	10	16.95	18	17.31
With MA units	9	20.00	3	5.08	12	11.54
CAR	19	42.22	17	28.81	36	34.62
MA graduate	8	17.78	21	35.59	29	27.88
Doctoral degree	1	2.22	8	13.56	9	8.65
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

#### Academic Rank

Table 1.2b shows data on the respondent's professional profile in terms of academic rank. As gleaned from the table 18 or 40.00% were Teacher I, 15 or 33.33% have reached the rank of Teacher III, 7 or 15.56% were Teacher II, 4 or 8.89% were Master Teacher I, and just 1 or 2.22% have achieved the rank of Master Teacher II. This limited representation in higher ranks suggest that a large portion of MAPEH major teachers are at the beginning stage concentrated in the entry-level position of their teaching career.

On the part of the non-MAPEH major teachers, 22 or 37.29% were Teacher III, 16 or 27.12% were Teacher I, 10 or 16.95%

were Teacher II, 8 or 13.56% were Master Teacher I and 3 or 5.08 were Master Teacher II. This distribution suggests that Non-MAPEH major teachers were more experienced teaching force, which may have been promoted already.

These observations are supported by Santos' study, which found that teaching effectiveness often relates with academic rank. Master Teachers—particularly those at levels I and II—demonstrated higher levels of instructional performance and classroom management.

**Table 1.2(b):** Frequency Distribution of Professional Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Academic Rank

Academic Rank	MAPEH Majors		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Teacher 1	18	40.00	16	27.12	34	32.69
Teacher 2	7	15.56	10	16.95	17	16.35
Teacher 3	15	33.33	22	37.29	37	35.58
MT 1	4	8.89	8	13.56	12	11.54
MT 2	1	2.22	3	5.08	4	3.85
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

#### Field of Specialization

Table 1.2c presents data on the respondents' professional profile in terms of field of specialization. The data shows that there were 45 MAPEH major teachers out of 104 teachers teaching MAPEH subject. This implies that they were trained in the four (4) MAPEH components: Music, Arts, Physical Education, and Health. This further suggests a highly specialized group of educators, where specialization allows students to benefit from teachers who not only understand the content deeply but also have the pedagogical skills specific to each MAPEH area.

In contrast, the profile of Non-MAPEH major teachers is more diverse, with concentrations in Values Education with 21 or 35.59%, Social Studies 14 or 23.72%, Mathematics 8 or 13.55%, Computer Education 7 or 11.86%, Science 6 or 10.16% and a smaller number with 3 or 5.08% specialized in English. This suggests that the school lacks MAPEH major teachers who are most qualified to handle the subject.

These insights align with Santillan's study, which found that MAPEH teachers with formal backgrounds in the arts or physical education delivered more effective instruction, particularly in practical subjects like music and dance.

**Table 1.2(c):** Frequency Distribution of Professional Personal of the respondents in Terms of Field of Specialization

Field Specialization	MAPEH Majors		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
MAPEH	45	100.00	0	0.00	45	43.27
English	0	0	3	5.08	3	2.88
Science	0	0	6	10.17	6	5.77
Mathematics	0	0	8	13.56	8	7.69
Social Studies	0	0	14	23.73	14	13.46
Values Education	0	0	21	35.59	21	20.19
Computer Education	0	0	7	11.86	7	6.73
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

#### Length of Teaching Experience

Table 1.2d illustrates data on respondent's professional profile



in terms of length of teaching experience. The data shows that 16 or 35.56% have been teaching for 6 to 10 years, experience, 12 or 26.67% have five years or less of experience, 10 or 22.22% have been teaching for eleven to fifteen years and 7 or 15.56%, have over 16 years of teaching experience. This indicates educators are less common in this group. These findings point to a workforce that's still growing and evolving.

Non-MAPEH major teachers tend to have more years in the profession. It shows that 18 or 30.51% have 16 years or more of teaching experience, 17 or 28.81% fall into the 11 to 15-year bracket, 16 or 27.12% had a teaching experience below five years and 8 or 13.56% had 6 to 10 years of teaching experience. This suggests a well-established group of professionals with a strong base of teaching experience. That said, 27.12% are in the early stages of their careers, reflecting a balance between incoming and veteran teachers. The relatively smaller percentage (13.56%) in the 6 to 10-year range may suggest some challenges in retention or career development during this stage.

Taken together, these patterns show distinct trajectories for MAPEH and Non-MAPEH teachers. MAPEH educators are mostly in the early to middle stages of their careers, while Non-MAPEH educators include more seasoned professionals. This difference calls for tailored strategies: MAPEH teachers might benefit from support programs that build their teaching foundations and leadership potential, while Non-MAPEH teachers may need initiatives that retain their expertise and encourage mentorship of younger staff.

These observations are consistent with the findings of Soriano, who emphasized the importance of experience in teaching MAPEH subjects effectively. Soriano also recommended easing Non-MAPEH teachers into MAPEH roles with less complex topics to help build their confidence. On the other hand, Buedron reported that nearly 80% of MAPEH teachers had five years or less of experience, which adds another perspective to the conversation. Both studies underscore the need for subject-specific training and professional development that matches teachers' experience and specialization.

**Table 1.2(d):** Frequency Distribution of Professional Profile of the respondents in Terms of Length of teaching experience

Length of Teaching Experience	MAPEH Majors		Non-MAPEH Majors		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
5 below	12	26.67	16	27.12	28	26.92
6 to 10	16	35.56	8	13.56	24	23.08
11 to 15	10	22.22	17	28.81	27	25.96
16 above	7	15.56	18	30.51	25	24.04
Total	45	100.00	59	100.00	104	100.00

### Seminars Attended

Table 1.2e presents the respondents professional profile in terms of seminars attended. The data reveals distinct patterns in professional development engagement. The results indicate that MAPEH major teachers are actively participating in professional development opportunities directly aligned with their field. Notably, the National Seminar Workshop in Dance had the highest attendance with 28 teachers involved. Other well-attended sessions included the Local Seminar Workshop in Music (12 attendees) and Coaching and Officiating (9 attendees). This trend suggests that MAPEH teachers invest in refining their subject-specific competencies and are also

responsive to opportunities that enhance their practical and performance-based instruction. The high level of participation points to a strong professional culture among MAPEH educators, which schools can support further by sustaining or expanding relevant seminar offerings.

Among Non-MAPEH major teachers, professional development engagement was noticeably lower. Only five (5) teachers attended the local training on fitness and exercises and first aid care and, management and 35 out of 59 Non-MAPEH teachers were reported to not attending any seminars. This infers that non-MAPEH major teachers are not interested to participate in seminars in MAPEH. The data highlight a need to re-evaluate how professional development is being communicated and delivered to Non-MAPEH educators to ensure their participation and growth are not overlooked.

The difference in professional development participation between the two groups is clear. MAPEH teachers are actively pursuing enrichment in their specific disciplines, while Non-MAPEH teachers show relatively minimal involvement. This gap underscores the need for a more inclusive and strategic professional development program. Institutions should consider conducting periodic needs assessments to align seminars with the actual instructional challenges teachers face. Moreover, promoting participation through incentives or clearer communication channels could improve attendance rates, especially among those who have yet to engage in any training.

These findings are in line with the work of Balanlay, whose study found that a significant number of teachers had not attended any formal training, particularly those with fewer years of experience and those teaching outside their area of expertise.

**Table 1.2(e):** Frequency Distribution of Professional Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Seminars attended

Seminars Attended	MAPEH Major Teachers		Non-MAPEH Major Teachers		Total	
	F	Rank	F	Rank	F	Rank
Local Seminar Workshop in Music	12	2	1	6.5	13	3
National Seminar Workshop in Dance	28	1	2	5	30	1
Regional/Local Seminar Workshop in Arts	7	6	1	6.5	8	7
National Regional/local Training on Teaching MAPEH	8	4.5	3	4	11	5.5
Local Training on Fitness and Exercises	6	7	5	1.5	11	5.5
local Seminar workshop Coaching and Officiating	9	3	4	3	13	3
local Training workshop on First Aid Care and Management	8	4.5	5	1.5	13	3
None	5		35		40	
*multiple responses						

### Teaching Practices

#### Classroom Instructional Process

Data shows that MAPEH major teachers consistently receive ratings ranging from "Very Good" to "Excellent" across all

instructional components of Music, Arts, Physical Education, and Health. The overall mean obtained in this indicator was 4.59 (teachers) 4.38 (students) and 4.39 (school head) interpreted as “Excellent”. These ratings from teachers themselves, their students, and school heads, suggest a high level of instructional competence. Notably high ratings include making art lessons engaging (Teacher: 4.85, Student: 4.73, Head: 4.70), clearly defining health objectives (Teacher: 4.72, Student: 4.70, Head: 4.63), and adapting PE lessons to varying student abilities (Teacher: 4.79, Student: 4.63, Head: 4.83). The close alignment of perceptions among all three groups highlights a consistent and effective teaching performance. These findings suggest that MAPEH major teachers are not only well-prepared in their subject matter but also effective in addressing diverse student needs, fostering creativity, and maintaining instructional clarity—likely supported by relevant and responsive professional development programs.

For Non-MAPEH major teachers, instructional performance also falls within the “Very Good” to “Excellent” range based on teacher, student, and school head evaluations, though with more variation. While they are rated well in areas such as promoting sportsmanship in PE (Teacher: 4.69, Student: 4.49) and engaging students in art lessons (Teacher: 4.65, Student: 4.46), discrepancies appear in school head assessments. For example, heads rate their use of music equipment (3.06) and clarity of instruction in Arts (3.30) significantly lower than the self and student evaluations. This gap suggests potential challenges in delivering specialized MAPEH content, especially for those teaching outside their primary field. The overall mean of 4.30 (teacher-rated) declines to 4.07 (students) and 3.78 (heads), indicating a need to align instructional practices with administrative expectations and possibly strengthen training for non-MAPEH teachers handling MAPEH subjects.

The findings reveal that while both groups demonstrate strong teaching practices, MAPEH majors consistently achieve higher and more aligned evaluations across all respondents. The performance gap in non-MAPEH teachers—particularly in specialized areas like music and arts—signals the need for more targeted professional support.

### Classroom Practices

MAPEH major teachers consistently demonstrate high levels of classroom management across all subjects (Music, Arts, Physical Education, and Health), receiving excellent ratings from themselves, their students, and department heads. Their weighted mean scores, including an overall mean of 4.71 (Teacher), 4.42 (Student), and 4.77 (department Head), indicate exceptional performance in creating structured, engaging, and respectful learning environments, effectively handling disruptions, and ensuring student participation and safety. The remarkable alignment of perceptions across all evaluators underscores their strong and consistent instructional competence in managing diverse classroom scenarios within their specialized fields.

Non-MAPEH major teachers also show commendable classroom management skills, generally falling within the “Very Good” to “Excellent” range. However, a noticeable disparity in ratings exists, particularly from department heads. While teacher self-ratings are generally “Excellent” (overall mean 4.35), student (overall mean 3.93) and head (overall mean 3.91) evaluations tend to be lower, often dipping into the “Very Good” category. This gap is evident in areas like creating structured music environments and handling health

discussions, suggesting that while these teachers manage general classroom behavior well, they may face more challenges in specialized MAPEH contexts, indicating a need for more targeted support.

The data clearly shows that while both MAPEH and non-MAPEH teachers exhibit strong classroom management, MAPEH major teachers consistently achieve higher and more consistent ratings across all evaluators and subject areas. The more significant changes and lower head assessments for non-MAPEH teachers highlight a performance gap in specialized MAPEH classroom management. This suggests that non-specialist teachers might benefit from focused professional development in subject-specific classroom management strategies, access to relevant resources, or mentorship from MAPEH specialists.

### Teaching Strategies

The data shows that MAPEH major teachers constantly exhibit strong teaching strategies across Music, Arts, Physical Education, and Health, generally receiving excellent ratings from all evaluators. Their overall mean scores for teaching strategies are particularly high 4.64 (Teacher), 4.58 (Student), and 4.69 (Head). They are highly effective in making compound concepts understandable, incorporating technology, providing practical opportunities, and encouragement student confidence, especially evident in Music and Arts. While their self and head ratings for “I demonstrate physical skills before practice” in PE show “Good” ratings (2.97 and 3.00 respectively), their student rating remains “Very Good” (4.00), and indicating overall tough and well-aligned teaching methodologies across most components.

Non-MAPEH major teachers also display generally strong teaching strategies, mostly achieving “Very Good” to “Excellent” ratings. However, a notable decline in perception is observed from teacher self-evaluations to student and head evaluations. Their overall mean scores for this section are 4.50 (Teacher, “Excellent”), but drop to 4.05 (Student, “Very Good”) and 4.04 (Head, “Very Good”). A significant discrepancy appears in Physical Education, specifically for “I demonstrate physical skills before practice,” where student ratings are 3.55 (Very Good) but head ratings fall to 2.58 (Fair). This suggests challenges in the practical demonstration of specialized physical skills, potentially due to a lack of specialized training or confidence in these areas.

### Student Evaluation

Student evaluation across all disciplines (Music, Arts, Physical Education, and Health). Their overall mean ratings for student evaluation are remarkably high, with Teachers at 4.64 (Excellent), Students at 4.26 (Excellent), and Heads at 4.66 (Excellent). These teachers excel in assessing both performance and theoretical knowledge, providing constructive feedback, fostering self-assessment, and adapting their teaching based on evaluation outcomes. While specific areas like assessing progress in PE received a “Good” from students (3.00), the overall consensus across all evaluators underscores their comprehensive, effective, and well-aligned student assessment practices within their specialized fields.

Non-MAPEH major teachers generally receive “Very Good” ratings for their student evaluation practices, indicated by overall mean scores of 4.12 (Teacher), 3.98 (Student), and 4.07 (Head). However, significant weaknesses emerge in the evaluation of specialized skills. Notably, in Music, students rated “I assess students’ creativity in music while also

evaluating their technical skills" at 3.00 (Good). A more pronounced challenge appears in Physical Education, where both teachers (2.95, Good) and students (2.66, Good) rated "I assess students' progress in developing their physical skills and fitness" considerably lower. These specific lower ratings suggest a potential lack of specialized knowledge or appropriate tools to effectively assess nuanced, performance-based skills in MAPEH, leading to inconsistencies in evaluation.

Overall total findings on the data on student evaluation practices highlights a clear proficiency gap between MAPEH and Non-MAPEH teachers. MAPEH major teachers demonstrate superior and consistent evaluation capabilities across all aspects of their subjects, reinforced by high inter-rater agreement. In difference, while non-MAPEH major teachers perform acceptably in general evaluation, their effectiveness diminishes in assessing specialized skills within MAPEH subjects, particularly in Music and Physical Education, as evidenced by lower "Good" ratings from students and themselves in specific components. This discrepancy suggests a critical need for targeted professional development for non-MAPEH major teachers.

### Relationship between Profile and Teaching Practices Personal Profile

The data presented in table 3.1 illustrate the relationship between teachers' personal profiles—specifically age, sex, and civil status and their teaching practices, which include classroom instructional process, classroom management, teaching strategies, and student evaluation. The Pearson correlation coefficients and their corresponding significance values were analyzed to determine whether these personal characteristics are associated with specific teaching behaviors. The analysis reveals that age has a statistically significant relationship with most aspects of teaching practices. There is a moderate positive correlation between age and both classroom instructional process ( $r = 0.501$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ) and classroom management ( $r = 0.522$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). These results suggest that older teachers are more likely to exhibit effective instructional and management practices, possibly due to their accumulated teaching experience and exposure to professional development opportunities. Furthermore, age is also significantly associated with student evaluation practices ( $r = 0.274$ ,  $p = 0.043$ ), although the strength of this relationship is weaker. However, there is no significant relationship between

age and teaching strategies ( $r = 0.108$ ,  $p = 0.814$ ), indicating that the use of diverse or innovative teaching strategies is not necessarily influenced by a teacher's age.

Regarding sex, the data show a significant correlation with two (2) teaching dimensions: classroom management and teaching strategies. Specifically, sex has a moderate to strong positive relationship with classroom management ( $r = 0.541$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ) and a stronger one with teaching strategies ( $r = 0.624$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). The positive correlation coefficients show that female teachers better manage classrooms and implement instructional methods compared to male teachers. In contrast, sex does not significantly relate to classroom instructional process ( $r = -0.084$ ,  $p = 0.091$ ) or student evaluation ( $r = 0.067$ ,  $p = 0.540$ ), suggesting that these aspects of teaching are not heavily influenced by gender.

The analysis of teacher personal profiles and their relationship with teaching practices yields actionable implications for professional development and faculty support. Specifically, the strong positive correlations between age and effective classroom instructional process and management underscore the significant value of accumulated teaching experience. This suggests that schools should leverage experienced teachers as mentors or coaches for younger colleagues in these foundational areas. However, the lack of a significant link between age and teaching strategies suggest that while experience enhances core practices, continuous professional development on innovative methodologies and diverse teaching strategies is essentials for all teachers, regardless of age, to ensure pedagogical adaptability. Furthermore, the strengths of female teachers in classroom management and teaching strategy implementation indicate an opportunity to identify and disseminate their effective practices across the faculty through peer learning or targeted workshops. On the other hand this also highlights a need for focused support and training for male teachers in these specific domains to ensure equitable development of essential teaching competencies across all educators, fostering a more effective and well-managed learning environment for all students.

The data suggest that age and sex are meaningful factors in shaping specific aspects of teaching practices, indicating the need for personalized approaches in teacher development programs. As age correlates positively with improvements in instructional processes and classroom management, this may reflect the role of experience and professional maturity in refining teaching techniques.

**Table 3.1:** Relationship between Personal Profile and Teaching Practices

Teachers Personal Profile	Parameters	Classroom Instructional Process	Classroom Management	Teaching Strategies	Student Evaluation
Age	Pearson r	0.501	0.522	0.108	0.274
	Significance	0.004	0.000	0.814	0.043
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant
Sex	Pearson r	-0.084	0.541	0.624	0.067
	Significance	0.091	0.005	0.000	0.54
	Interpretation	Not significant	Significant	Significant	Not Significant
Civil Status	Pearson r	0.064	0.101	0.108	0.106
	Significance	0.341	0.297	0.555	0.34
	Interpretation	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

### Professional Profile

The data presented in table 3.2 reveals the relationship

between the professional profile and the level of the teaching practices of the respondents. Teachers with higher educational

attainment demonstrate a statistically significant moderate positive correlation with both classroom instructional process ( $r = 0.413$ ,  $p = 0.008$ ) and classroom management ( $r = 0.381$ ,  $p = 0.008$ ). This suggests that a greater investment in formal education beyond baseline qualifications tends to equip teachers with more effective methods for delivering instruction and maintaining an orderly classroom environment. However, highest educational attainment shows no significant relationship with teaching strategies or student evaluation practices.

This suggest that while advanced degrees strengthen fundamental instructional and management skills, they may not naturally widen a teacher's collection of different teaching strategies or refine their student evaluation techniques. Therefore, professional development initiatives should encourage teachers to pursue higher education for core teaching competencies, but separately offer specialized training or workshops focused on innovative teaching strategies and effective student assessment methods.

Academic rank presents a complex relationship with teaching practices. There is a statistically significant negative correlation with classroom instructional process ( $r = -0.391$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ), meaning that as academic rank increases, apparent effectiveness in direct classroom instruction inclines to decrease. This permits further investigation to understand if higher ranks lead to more administrative roles, specialized teaching responsibilities that are observed differently, or a shift in focus away from day-to-day instructional delivery.

Equally, academic rank shows a significant positive correlation with teaching strategies ( $r = 0.381$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), indicating that higher-ranked teachers are more likely to employ a diverse range of pedagogical approaches. There is no significant relationship with classroom management or student evaluation. The implication is two-fold institutions should explore ways to maintain or enhance the direct instructional effectiveness of higher-ranked teachers, perhaps through reduced non-teaching loads or refresher courses, while simultaneously making the most of their expertise in diverse teaching strategies to mentor and train other faculty

members.

Length of teaching experience is a prevailing of several teaching practices, showing statistically significant moderate positive correlations with classroom instructional process ( $r = 0.508$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), teaching strategies ( $r = 0.391$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ), and student evaluation ( $r = 0.391$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ). This indicates that more experienced teachers are generally better at delivering instruction, utilizing varied teaching methods, and effectively assessing student learning. Unexpectedly, unlike age from a previous analysis, length of experience does not show a significant relationship with classroom management. This suggests that while maturity or other age-related factors might contribute to management skills, the sheer number of years in the classroom alone doesn't directly enhance it. The overall implication is clear retaining experienced teachers is vital for strong instructional performance, strategic teaching, and robust student evaluation. Furthermore, schools should provide targeted professional development for less experienced teachers in these areas and investigate specific factors that contribute to classroom management effectiveness beyond mere years of service.

The analysis reveals no statistically significant relationship between the kind or nature of training/seminars attended and any of the dignified teaching practices (classroom instructional process, classroom management, teaching strategies, or student evaluation). This is a serious finding, as it suggests that simply attending training or seminars, regardless of their nature, does not automatically translate into observable improvements in teaching behaviours. The implication is that schools should evaluate the effectiveness and impact of their professional development programs. Future efforts should move beyond mere attendance and focus on the quality, relevance, and most importantly, the practical application and addition of learned skills into daily teaching. This may require follow-up support, peer coaching, mentorship, or outcome-based evaluations to ensure that training translates into concrete enhancements in teacher performance.

**Table 3.2:** Relationship between Professional Profile and Teaching Practices

Teachers Professional Profile	Parameters	Classroom instructional Process	Classroom Management	Teaching Strategies	Student Evaluation
Highest Educational Attainment	Pearson r	0.413	0.381	0.117	0.094
	Significance	0.008	0.008	0.24	0.412
	Interpretation	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant
Academic Rank	Pearson r	-0.391	-0.097	0.381	-0.087
	Significance	0.005	0.234	0.001	0.413
	Interpretation	Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant
Length of Teaching Experience	Pearson r	0.508	0.039	0.391	0.391
	Significance	0.001	0.547	0.003	0.013
	Interpretation	Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Significant
Kind/Nature of training/seminars attended	Pearson r	0.035	0.108	0.088	0.111
	Significance	0.421	0.44	0.235	0.347
	Interpretation	Not significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant

## Conclusions

There is a demographic difference between MAPEH major and non-MAPEH teachers age, were MAPEH major teachers are generally younger, married females in entry-level positions, have completed the academic requirements of their graduate degrees and have been teaching for less than ten

years, and their training mainly focused on dance. While non-MAPEH major teachers tend to be older, married females with master's degree, higher teaching rank, mostly specialized in values education, and over 16 years of teaching experience, and have attended trainings in fitness exercise and first aid. Both MAPEH majors and non-MAPEH major/teachers



signify lack of trainings and seminars on the key areas of MAPEH.

MAPEH major teachers demonstrate very satisfactory to outstanding teaching performance particularly excelling in managing learning environment and addressing learner diversity. Non-MAPEH major teachers excel in content knowledge and pedagogy with very satisfactory ratings in learning environment and learner diversity. This suggests that both groups possess commendable teaching capabilities, however their strengths lie in different domains. This further suggests that both MAPEH major and non-MAPEH major teachers would benefit from additional trainings and workshops.

Relationship of personal profile of teachers significantly influence their teaching practices. Specifically, age plays a role in classroom instructional process, classroom management, and student evaluation, suggesting that experience associated with age may shape a teacher's approach in these areas. Similarly, sex is linked to classroom management and teaching strategies, indicating potential gender-related differences in pedagogical styles. This implication of recruitment, professional development, and support programs for teachers should consider the varying influences of age and sex on teaching behaviors, while recognizing that marital status may not be a relevant factor in predicting teaching effectiveness.

A teacher's professional profile, encompassing educational attainment, academic rank, and teaching experience, significantly influences their teaching practices in areas like instructional processes, classroom management, and student evaluation. This highlights the importance of investing in proper education and valuing experience to improvement teaching quality. On the other hand, the minimal impact of trainings and seminars suggests their current design or relevance may need re-evaluation for greater effectiveness.

### Recommendations

- i). School administrators may design and implement training programs for both MAPEH majors and non-MAPEH majors teachers focusing not only on dance and fitness exercises, but also in other key areas of the MAPEH curriculum. MAPEH majors may be encouraged to pursue higher education to meet promotion requirements and professional standards.
- ii). To ensure consistently high-quality MAPEH education across all teaching assignments, schools could assign MAPEH subjects to MAPEH major teachers whenever possible. The school could also provide professional development programs like trainings, seminars and workshops that will focus on enhancing the practical teaching skills, of both MAPEH major and non-MAPEH major teachers especially in the use of proper musical instruments in music and providing instructions in arts.
- iii). Educational institutions may implement multi-faceted professional development programs that incorporate strong mechanisms for external feedback and self-reflection that ought to enhance teachers' awareness, focus groups, or peer-observation and coaching sessions; helping them understand where their self-perceptions might differ from external realities.

### References

1. Abdullahi, Osman T, Oloruntoba AO & Akintunde IO. The Impact of Marital Status on Teachers' Performance in Secondary Schools in Ifelodun Local Government

Area, Kwara State Journal of Education and Practice, 2017.

2. Atienza, Maria Ela L & Hernandez AD. Instructional Competence and Teaching Performance of MAPEH Teachers in the Division of Batangas City. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2017.
3. Balanlay, Noricar O. Profile, Epistemological Beliefs, Pedagogical practices and performance of out of field Teachers in the secondary schools of the second district of northern Samar, Master of arts in Education major in administration and supervision, University of Eastern Philippines, 2023.
4. Buedron, Nimfa F. Knowledge and skills of non-MAPEH Major Teacher and Academic Performance of Students in Physical Education. Doctoral of Education major in Physical Education, Southwestern University, Cebu City, 2016.
5. CHED memorandum Circular (CMO) 80 series of 2017.
6. Froilan, Lucilyn B. Variates Related to the Teaching Practices of Physical Education Majors and Non-Physical Education Majors Teaching PE in the selected Public Secondary Schools in the Second Congressional District of Northern Samar, *G International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, 2019.
7. Gonzales, Regielenes S. Class evaluation and teaching enhancement at the University of Santo Tomas. *Journal of Educational Practices in the Philippines*, 2017.
8. Lluz, Winston Galit: Difficulties Encountered by non-physical Education, Health and Music major Teacher Teaching PEHM in the second district of Northern Samar, Master of Arts in Physical Education, Major in Physical Education, University of Eastern Philippines.